LIBRARY
Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J
Division
No. Case, 100-
No. Shelf, Section 2
No. Book, No. 28

BX 2220 .D856 1833
Du Moulin, Pierre, 1568-1658.
The anatomy of the Mass

THE

ANATOMY OF THE MASS:

By PETER DU MOULIN,

MINISTER OF THE WORD OF GOD IN THE CHURCH OF SEDAN,
AND PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY.

NEWLY TRANSLATED FROM THE FRENCH.

TO WHICH IS PREFIXED,

A CONCISE

HISTORY OF THE EUCHARIST.

By the REV. ROBERT SHANKS, A.M.

Du Moulin avoit beaucoup d'esprit et une erudition très recherchée.
Bossuet.

WAUGH AND INNES, EDINBURGH;
WM. COLLINS, GLASGOW; WM. CURRY, JUN., DUBLIN;
AND JAMES NISBET, LONDON.
MDCCCXXXIII.

A. COLVILLE, PRINTER, GLASGOW.

CONTENTS.

PAGE.

A Concise Historical Account of Opinions relating to the Eucharist, - - - - - - 13

The Anatomy of the Mass.

Chapter I.

The Institution of the Holy Supper, by Jesus Christ, according as it is contained in the Apostle Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians, - - - - - - - 114

Chapter II.

Thirty-four contrarieties between the Holy Supper and the Mass; and how much the Romish Church hath departed from the Institution of the Lord, - - - - - - 116

Chapter III.

In what manner the change in the Institution of the Lord hath altered the nature of the Sacrament,—and that there is no Consecration in the Mass, - - - - - 130

Chapter IV.

That by the Institution of the Lord, the Roman Church hath changed the Nature of Jesus Christ, - - - - 131

Chapter V.

Concerning the audacity of the Jesuit Maldonat, in contradicting Paul and Luke, and correcting Matthew and Mark,—and concerning the Fruit of the Vine, - - - - - 134

Chapter VI.

Of the great dishonour done to Jesus Christ by this doctrine,—of the indelible character,—and of the power of creating our Creator, - - - - - - - 137

Chapter VII.

That the words of the Mass itself are contradictory to Transubstantiation, - - - - - - - 140

CHAPTER VIII.

PAGE.

Recrimination of our Adversaries, - - - - 142

CHAPTER IX.

Of the causes wherefore the Pope will not allow any change in the Mass, nor conform to the Institution of the Lord, - 143

CHAPTER X.

Passages in which the Doctors and Councils of the Roman Church maintain, that the Pope and Church of Rome are not subject to Scripture, and that they have power to annul and abolish the Commandments of God, - - - 144

CHAPTER XI.

That the exposition we give of these words, "This is my body," is conformed to Scripture,—to the nature of the Sacraments,—was attested by the Fathers, and is confirmed by our adversaries, - - - - - - - 149

CHAPTER XII.

That our adversaries, to avoid a clear and natural figure, invent multitude of others, harsh and uncommon, and do not speak but in figurative terms—and of Berenger's Confession, - 154

CHAPTER XIII.

Respecting the ascension and absence of the Lord, and the affirmation of our adversaries, who say, that in the Sacrament he is sacramentally present, - - - - - 157

CHAPTER XIV.

Confession of our adversaries admitting that Transubstantiation is not founded in Scripture,—that the Ancient Church consecrated by prayer, and not by these words, This is my body, 162

CHAPTER XV.

Of the adoration of the Sacrament.—Opinion of the Romish Church, - - - - - - 165

CHAPTER XVI.

The adoration of the Sacrament examined by the word of God.—The ancient Christians did not worship the Sacrament, 168

CHAPTER XVII.

Of the intention of the Priest, without which the Romish Church believes that there is neither Consecration nor Transubstantiation, - - - - - - - 173

CHAPTER XVIII.

That our opponents embarrass themselves in this matter with absurdities and insolvable contradictions, - - - 178

CHAPTER XIX.

PAGE.

Of accidents without subjects.—Passages of the Fathers, - 186

CHAPTER XX.

Answers to certain examples of Scripture, which our adversaries bring to prove, that the body of Christ has been in two different places at the same time, - - - - 189

CHAPTER XXI.

Concerning the dignity of the Priests.—That our adversaries debase the utility and efficacy of Masses, and render them unavailing for the remission of sins.—And concerning the sale of Masses, - - - - - - 192

CHAPTER XXII.

That the Roman religion is novel, and was invented for the benefit of the Pope and the Clergy, - - - - 199

CHAPTER XXIII.

Answer to the Question addressed to us,—Where was your religion before Calvin? - - - - - 204

CHAPTER XXIV.

That our opponents reject the Fathers, and speak of them with contempt, - - - - - - 213

CHAPTER XXV.

Concerning the corruption and falsification of the writings of the Fathers, and the difficulty of understanding them, - 217

CHAPTER XXVI.

Passages of the Fathers adverse to Transubstantiation, and to the oral manducation of Christ's body, - - - 221

CHAPTER XXVII.

Confirmation of the same, by the Customs of the Ancient Church, 234

CHAPTER XXVIII.

Explanation of the Passages of the Fathers, wherein they say that we eat the body and blood of the Lord in the Eucharist,—that the bread is changed into the body of Christ, and is made the body of Christ,—particularly of Ambrose, Hilary, and Chrysostom,—that the Fathers speak of various kinds of body and blood of Christ, - - - - - 236

CHAPTER XXIX.

That several of the Fathers believed a mystical union of Christ's Divinity with the Sacramental bread, - - - 244

CHAPTER XXX.

PAGE.

The particular opinion of Augustine, Fulgentius, and Innocent III. - - - - - - - 252

CHAPTER XXXI.

That the Roman Church condemning impanation, has herself fallen, by Transubstantiation, into an error a thousand times more pernicious—And concerning the worship of the accidents of bread, - - - - - - 253

CHAPTER XXXII.

That the Sacrifice of the Mass was not instituted by Jesus Christ. —Confession of our adversaries, - - - - 255

CHAPTER XXXIII.

That the Sacrifice of the Mass accords neither with Scripture nor with reason, - - - - - - 257

CHAPTER XXXIV.

In what sense the Holy Supper may be called a sacrifice.—Concerning the sacrifice of Melchizedek, and the oblation spoken of in Malachi, - - - - - 262

CHAPTER XXXV.

In what sense the Fathers called the Eucharist a Sacrifice, 264

CHAPTER XXXVI.

Of the two kinds of manducation of Christ's body,—namely, of the corporal and spiritual, and which is the better, - 267

CHAPTER XXXVII.

That in the sixth chapter of John, the Lord neither speaks of the Sacrament of the Eucharist, nor of the oral manducation of his flesh, - - - - - - 271

CHAPTER XXXVIII.

That the Church of Rome deprives the people of salvation by this doctrine, - - - - - - - 276

CHAPTER XXXIX.

That the principal Doctors of the Roman Church, and even the Popes, agree with us on this point, and hold that the Discourse in John, chap. vi. relates to spiritual manducation, and that those who contradict them speak with uncertainty, - 279

CHAPTER XL.

Reasons by which our adversaries attempt to prove that the Discourse in John vi. relates to oral manducation, - - 282

CHAPTER XLI.

Testimony of the Fathers, - - - - - 286

PREFACE.

It is a favourite opinion with many, that infidelity is the most efficacious means of extirpating superstition, and of emancipating the minds of men from the dominion of ghostly fears. A rooted disbelief of a divine revelation, and of the special superintendence of a divine providence, it is imagined, are the sure characteristics of an enlightened, enlarged, and vigorous understanding. To banish from the mind all thoughts of God's special care over his creatures, and to tread, at the very least, upon the brink of infidelity, are regarded as attainments necessary to all who would escape the brand of bigotry and fanaticism. These opinions have been presented to men in every variety of form, and with the most attractive allurements. It was thus that they were promulgated in France by the Encyclopedists, before her first memorable, and deeply blood-stained revolution.—No one at all acquainted with the current literature, but is aware that infidelity is incessantly diffused, sometimes under thin disguises; and is obtruded frequently upon the public gaze free from all flimsy concealment. Not even the most cursory observer but knows that thousands of our artisans and mechanics are in being seduced by it into the broad ways of perdition; and that the miserably-deluded men, after having pronounced the word of God to be a lie, imagine they have emancipated themselves from an enslaving superstition,—have burst asunder the bonds of God's eter-

nal laws,—have started into a noble freedom, and are careering onward with a heroic ardour in the path of philosophic perfectibility. Woful infatuation! Is the glorious light of heaven changed into a Cimmerian darkness? Though human rites, of dark invention, obscure its splendour, yet are not its faintest glimmerings preferable to midnight blackness? Even disfigured, corrupted, and misrepresented, Christianity is undoubtedly better than an utter ignorance of the divine will. But the corruptions which mar the heavenly aspect of our religion, and retard its progress, cannot be removed by disbelieving Christianity itself, but only by a more careful examination of the book in which its doctrines are contained. The human mind cannot be disenthralled from the slavery of superstitious fears, by proscribing the existence of the invisible objects that excite those fears, but only by communicating to it that "lively hope" which can elevate it above them. Superstition, in all its forms, can be extirpated only by filling the soul abundantly with that "faith which is the evidence of things not seen, the substance of things hoped for." This being so—and I am persuaded it cannot be successfully contested—then certain popular notions that float widely among the half-thinking, are most chimerical and pernicious; and are the more to be dreaded, because they lull men into a fancied security when dangers the most fearful are gathering around.

Because knowledge is said to be widely diffused, and because prevailing opinions obviously tend to infidelity, therefore to apprehend that the superstitions of Popery can now obtain proselytes, or become dangerous by its strength, is ridiculed as the glaring folly of a madman. But in truth the folly lies in imagining that vague and speculative notions can nullify opposing facts; for that Popery is making alarming progress, none who have examined the subject dare deny. We are very apt to be deceived by the vague sense in which the term knowledge is popularly used. No doubt the more we have of general knowledge, the less liable we are to imposition. But in order that knowledge may be a sufficient antidote to error, it must refer always to the subject of the error. A knowledge of astronomical science will prevent men from falling into the ancient error of supposing

that the world is supported upon the back of an elephant, but will it enable them to disprove the Pope's supremacy? The knowledge of chronology and geology will prevent us from being imposed upon by the fabulous pretences of the Chinese to antiquity, or by the whimsical theories that have been invented concerning the formation of the earth; but will not in the slightest assist us in determining whether the Pope be the infallible judge of religious controversy. Will the knowledge of chemistry enable any one to decide whether there be two or seven sacraments, or a divinely appointed sacrifice of the Mass? Will the knowledge of mechanical powers or of political economy, enable any one to disprove the Romish distinction of venial and mortal sins? That knowledge, therefore, which is to serve as an antidote to Popery, must refer directly to the subjects of controversy; but of this, it is to be feared, the community in general is exceedingly defective. At the Reformation, these subjects were constantly discussed, and Protestantism then progressed rapidly. But as they gradually ceased to occupy general attention, its boundaries became stationary. The vigilant adversaries of the Reformation have never abated in their hatred to it, nor have they suffered any rust to invade their weapons of warfare; and from being united and always ready for the contest, they are now obtaining mighty advantages over our disunited, straggling, and inactive bands.

The deficiency of knowledge, as a check against the encroachments of Popery, is not, as many foolishly suppose, supplied by the liberalism, infidelity, and boasted aversion of the age to superstition; for, as the distance between errors is always much less than between truth and error, the transition from infidelity to Romanism is easier than from infidelity into the belief of Evangelical truth. This, perhaps, may not obtain credence so readily, as it is adverse to the opinions of various religious and irreligious theorists, but it may easily be evidenced by the most stubborn proof. Were the nations of antiquity, who knew not God, void of superstition? Did the philosophy of Socrates, Plato, or Cicero, deliver them from an idolatrous creed? Was not France a wholly infidel, if not a wholly atheistical country, at the

period of her first revolution, and yet how short a space intervened till once the millions of her sprightly sons professed themselves the devotees of the Roman Church, and the defenders of her superstitions, which are apparently as firmly entrenched in liberal and demi-infidel, as ever they were in bigotted and despotic France. Neither has neology or theological liberalism opposed a more formidable bulwark to Popery. Witness the numerous conversions to Romanism in Germany since the commencement of this century, both among princes and people. Saxony, which cradled the Reformation, is now governed by a Popish Prince and Popish Court. In Saxe Gotha, Westphalia, Anhalt, &c. the sovereign Princes are become Papists. Strasburgh, the seat of a French Protestant university, contained, at one period, only a few Roman Catholic families, and now more than 30,000, out of a population of 50,000, are joined to the Church of Rome. Geneva, once the metropolis of Calvinism, has so far relapsed into Popery, that it has been re-established in this celebrated city. The whole Canton was incorporated with the Roman diocese of Lusanne in the year 1819.

Many ineffectual attempts have been made by the Papal Court for subjugating the Greek Church to the Roman yoke, but time will shew whether the Plenipotentiaries of Great Britain and her allies have not done more for the accomplishment of that work, by placing on the Grecian throne the son of the Bavarian king—a most bigotted Romanist in religion, though a liberal in politics—than all the Papal efforts of centuries could achieve. We shall not do the disciples of Loyola the injustice to suppose they do not know how to take advantage of their good fortune.

Certain noisy pretenders to new views of truth are incessantly calling to us, See how religion prospers in America, where it receives no blighting glance from the official countenance,—no deadly taint from the pestiferous support of the civil magistrate!—See how the Christian graces multiply and luxuriate abundantly in that land!—Behold how full and joyous it is with the melody of Zion's songs! Yet, alas! how are the godly ceasing, and the faithful perishing, where all are free! How sadly

has Protestantism degenerated in the American soil, where it was planted by the Puritans of England. Why are the temples so much deserted by the "multitudinous sects?" Why are so many altars forsaken? Has truth, when free from magisterial sanction and support—unpropitious as some think them—universally or even generally prevailed by the irresistibility of its own native influence? The state of American Popery will supply the answer. In the year 1789, thirteen years after the declaration of American independence, the Roman Catholics throughout the whole of the United States, were estimated at 18,000. In the year 1830 they amounted to 500,000; and now are reckoned at 800,000, which is an increase of 300,000 in little more than two years. If the future correspond with the past, they will, in all probability, ere long be the most numerous religious community in the great Republican Confederation. These important and astounding facts demand the most grave and serious consideration. Do they not prove that liberalism and infidelity are most nutritious soils for the plant of Popery? Well may Romanists vaunt of their American triumphs.

No such fatal calamity—no such national degradation, has yet befallen Great Britain, still Popery has even here made vast progress since the commencement of the present century, and especially within the last five years. England has 7 Popish Colleges and 412 Chapels. Scotland has her well-endowed Romish College of Blairs, near Aberdeen, where the important boon of gratuitous education is afforded to all designed for the ecclesiastical state, after their capacities have been approved by one year's trial—and also her 56 chapels, besides numerous preaching stations. Romish bishops have now assumed an ecclesiastical jurisdiction over every county in our land, and Popish missionaries are out and proselytizing through the various cities, towns, villages, and glens of our country. Are these the proofs that ours is an enlightened age? True Protestants are now hemmed in on every side. Their enemies are making daily encroachments: and will they still dream of reposing in quiet security—a most dangerous dream—a fancied, false, and fatal security. Their enemies want neither skill nor daring. No

penal enactments now repel their adversaries' advance, and treacherous men lurk within their own camp. It is time, then, for them to gird on their armour and be vigilant.—The crisis demands that all true Protestants should lay aside their petty and ignoble strifes, which have produced so many destructive divisions, and be formed into one noble phalanx, bound together by mutual and inextinguishable love, and then indeed would they oppose a formidable front to all corrupters and mutilators of God's Holy Word. But should there be too few desirous of the blessing to be bestowed upon the "peacemakers," or should their benevolent efforts fail of success, yet, in spite of the flagrant defections of many in these "last days," and in spite of all the dangers of the "perilous times," we feel confident that many still cling with a noble fidelity to the doctrines of the Reformation, and that some of them may yet emulate the genius and erudition of Du Moulin and Claude—the controversial prowess of Stillingfleet and Chillingworth—and rival even the dauntless intrepidity of Knox and Thomson, in defence of the truth, purity, and integrity of the Word of God.

Whilst few original productions upon the Romish Controversies are offered to the public, I take the liberty of presenting a new Translation of Du Moulin's celebrated Treatise, entitled, THE ANATOMY OF THE MASS. The French copy which I possess was printed at Geneva in the year 1636. It is divided into two books. In the latter part of the second there is a refutation of certain impious opinions held by some Jesuits, which ought never to be recalled to remembrance, and also a short history of Transubstantiation, and its concomitant errors, which I have had an opportunity of treating with more exactness and method in the CONCISE HISTORY OF THE EUCHARIST,—the latter chapters of the second book are therefore suppressed, and the former, which relate to spiritual manducation, are annexed to the end of the first book, so that Du Moulin's Treatise now appears without any other division than that of chapters. If any one rise from the perusal of it without being convinced that the pretended Infallible Church has sometimes erred in matters of Faith, I doubt whether he will be convinced by any demonstration.

A CONCISE

HISTORICAL ACCOUNT OF OPINIONS

RELATING TO THE

EUCHARIST.

Infallibility, in decreeing and expounding articles of Faith, is an attribute which the Romish Church arrogates to herself. If any Church possessed so desirable a privilege, she must have enjoyed it from the first promulgation of Christianity, because it is pretended that evidence of its being conferred by Jesus Christ, the Head and Founder of the Church, is contained in the Gospel; and hence it must likewise continue with her to the end of time, for she can have no power to divest herself of this high prerogative. If it had been truly possessed, it would of necessity follow, that, from the beginning of the Christian era down to the present time, there has been one uniform and consistent system of doctrine. If it can be made to appear from history that the Romish Church hath varied from the uniformity of her doctrine, or if she hath at any time declared a particular tenet to be true doctrine, which is directly repugnant to that which she maintained at a different period, then it must be clear that her claim to infallibility is but a vain pretence. There is another way in which the invalidity of that claim may be exposed. Let any of the doctrines she has solemnly sanctioned by her authority by

proved erroneous, and it will be evident that she erred in giving it that sanction, and cannot, therefore, have the prerogative of infallibility.

Whilst the question of Catholic Emancipation was still pending, many of its Protestant advocates, either through ignorance or disingenuity, loudly disclaimed this dogma on behalf of the Irish Roman Catholic; and the priesthood, perceiving it would be of advantage to their Church at that particular period that the disclaimers should be believed, quietly acquiesced in the imputed renunciation of infallibility. Not a few have thence embraced the opinion that Popery has abandoned some of its absurdities; and that those glaring errors which seem to us so abominable, can be charged on the ignorant Papists of former times only, and are not to be imputed to the enlightened Romanists of this age. We should rejoice to have some ground for believing this. We should be glad were it even left uncontradicted by facts. But are not the candidates for the sacred office, in all their seminaries and colleges, most carefully instructed in the various quibbles and subtilties by which this dogma may be defended? Of such primary importance is it still reckoned, that it occupies an early and prominent place in the system of theological education. On a late occasion, the theological professor in the faculty of the Sorbonne, commenced his course by expounding in what manner infallibility may be maintained and defended.

By the preference thus given to this doctrine, it would seem to be regarded by Romanists as an equally essential and fundamental principle in their system of dogmatic theology as the geometrician holds the axioms to be on which the whole system of geometry is founded. No unnecessary or undue importance is here assigned to this doctrine. It must be regarded as indisputable as an axiom; for unless the traditions

and decrees of councils proceeded from an infallible mind, they could not be alleged as competent proofs of any doctrine. In truth, this is the tenet which gives union and stability to the entire system. It is the very key-stone of the papal arch. Remove it, and the ghostly fabric will tumble to the dust. For if Romanists had not a pretended infallible judge, to whose decision they might refer every matter in controversy, there would be no alternative left them but to appeal to the Supreme authority of Scripture, as we do; and whenever that is done, it will probably be followed by consequences similar to those that resulted from the appeal made to the lively oracles of God, at the ever-memorable era of the Reformation.

If transubstantiation be not a true doctrine, there can be no infallibility in the authority which sanctioned it. "But there is no proposition in the world more evidently true, than that transubstantiation is evidently false." If it be true, it must be believed to be so, in opposition to the principles upon which we yield our assent to any other proposition whatsoever—yea, in opposition to the very grounds on which we believe in revelation itself. If there be reason, therefore, to believe in transubstantiation, there can be no reason to believe in any thing else. The reader will find this observation completely verified by a perusal of the *Anatomy of the Mass*.

It is confessed by some of the most learned of the Romanists, as Occam, Dun Scotus, and others, that transubstantiation cannot be proved from Scripture. Bellarmine admits this is not improbable. Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, of high authority, and a reputed martyr among the Papists, ingenuously acknowledges, that "in the words of the institution, there is not one word from which the true presence of the flesh and blood of Christ, in our Mass,

can be proved."* But, then, it is argued that transubstantiation, according to the Romish exposition of our Lord's words, must have been the uniform and continual belief of the Church, otherwise such a peculiar interpretation could never have been introduced without the most notable opposition; and it is contended, that the time of its introduction cannot be specified, nor any circumstantial account given of opposition to it;—from thence it is inferred, that transubstantiation hath been the perpetual belief of the Church. This is the sum of Arnauld's celebrated demonstration, in his book on the Perpetuity of the Faith; but this pretended demonstration is built upon a palpable fallacy. It assumes that this doctrine is true, and has been believed ever since the first promulgation of Christianity; not on account of intrinsic credibility, or external evidence, but because it is supposed that those who impugn it cannot condescend upon the time and manner in which it originated. This supposed inability might, however, arise from the defective skill or learning of opponents, or from defective or mutilated records of the transactions of the times. But inability to prove a particular fact, cannot be construed into a proof of the verity of another directly opposite. Inability to prove a panel guilty, is not tantamount to a proof of innocence. There hath been a controversy respecting the first invention of the art of printing; but who, from that, would conclude that the art had existed from the remotest antiquity. The time, however, has been ascertained, as shall by and by appear, when the pernicious doctrine

---

* See Archbishop Tillotson's Discourse on Transubstantiation.—Finding the authority of the Church too weak an argument, later defenders of Romanism – Bossuet, Hay, Milner, Doyle—rely chiefly upon the literal meaning of the words, This is my body.

of transubstantiation was broached,—by whom, by whom opposed, and by whom at last decreed.

Could it be shewn, that in the present Liturgy of the Romish Church, there is no Canon of the Mass—or that her theological writers never employ the word transubstantiation, or words of equivalent import—would any one hesitate to admit that the Mass service is no part of her worship in the present age, and that transubstantiation is not an article of belief? And will it be denied, that the absence of these from the writings of the primitive Fathers, and the earliest Liturgies, is conclusive evidence that no such opinion or practice then existed?

Corresponding to the simplicity of character that distinguished the Christians of apostolic times, was the simplicity of their form of worship. They adhered closely to the pattern our Lord had left them. In celebrating that solemn service, which the Lord instituted for a perpetual ordinance, the faithful presented oblations of bread and wine upon the sacred table, in acknowledgment that God is the giver of every good gift; thereafter a portion of the oblation was consecrated by prayer and thanksgiving, and then broken and distributed among the people, to be eaten and drunk as the memorial of Christ's sacrifice of himself.*

To this ordinance a variety of names were given; some denoting the action, or part of it—some the manner of performance—others the beneficial effects resulting from the right observance of it.

To these sources may be traced almost all the principal names by which this ordinance has been known; and as the design of this introduction to Du Moulin's Treatise on the

---

* Compare Mede on the Christian Sacrifice, Larroque Hist. de L'Euch. c. 8, Cabasilas Expos. Litur. c. 2.

Mass is to place the opinions of the Fathers in regard to the *subject* and *object* of the Eucharist before the reader in chronological order, it may be of advantage to premise, according to the same method, some brief notices of the chief names that have been given to this Holy Sacrament. But it may serve to illustrate the analogy and harmony subsisting between the Old and New Testaments, and to give us clearer and more definite ideas respecting the nature and properties of the Holy Sacrament of the Supper, and also to shew us the origin and appropriateness of some of its most noted names, to advert, first of all, to the relation in which the people of God were placed under the Jewish economy, and the sacrifices then offered up preparatory to, and prefigurative of, the great sacrifice of the cross, in which they all received their grand consummation.

The Jews were a privileged and peculiar people, because they were a covenanted people. God chose Abram, and promised—that is, bound himself by the pledge of his own eternal veracity—to him, while he was yet childless, and greatly advanced in years, to give him a seed, numerous as the stars of heaven, and likewise the land wherein he dwelt, for an inheritance. "God called Abram from among his kindred, and said unto him, I will bless thee, and make thee a great nation, and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed." Gen. xii.—The promise is renewed in Gen. xv.; where it is added, "And Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness." Yet he immediately afterwards enquired, How shall I know, or what shall be the pledge of these things? Then God commanded to take, or offer, a heifer, a she goat, a turtle dove, and a young pigeon. And Abram did so, and divided them in the midst, and placed the one part opposite the other; and at the going down of the sun, a smoking furnace and burning lamp

passed between the pieces. And thus God that day made a covenant with Abram. The sacrifice was the ratification and seal of it.

Again: after Moses had delivered the ten commandments, and other precepts recorded in Exodus xx. and three subsequent chapters, the people answered, "All the words which the Lord hath said unto us we will do. Then Moses built an altar and twelve pillars, according to the tribes of Israel, and caused burnt-offerings to be offered, and peace-offerings of oxen to be sacrificed, unto the Lord. And Moses took *half* the blood and put into basins, and *half* of the blood he sprinkled upon the altar. Then he read the book of the Covenant in the audience of the people. And they again answered, *All* that the Lord hath said will we do, and be obedient. And Moses took the blood and sprinkled it upon the people; and said, Behold the blood of the Covenant which the Lord hath made with you concerning all these words." In instituting the Holy Supper, our Lord himself said, "This cup is the New Testament, or Covenant, in my blood." Now a Covenant is an agreement, entered into by at least two distinct parties, upon certain conditions, to which they are mutually pledged; or these conditions are dictated by the superior party, and accepted by the inferior, as in the case between the Creator and the creature. These are essential properties of a covenant. —To denote the very solemn obligations which we take upon ourselves by partaking of the symbols commemorating the ratification of the New Covenant by Christ's sacrifice of himself, the Roman Christians made use of the appropriate term Sacrament, which then commonly signified the oath of obedience the Roman soldiers took to their general. The sacramental cup is called the New Testament in Christ's blood; which, as Dr. Lightfoot justly remarks,

was " Not only the seal of the Covenant, but the sanction of the New Covenant—the end of the Mosaic ceremony, and the confirming of a new one. The confirmation of the Old Covenant was by the *blood of bulls and of goats*, (Exod. xxiv. Heb. xii.,) because blood was still to be shed: the confirmation of the new one was by a cup of wine; because, under the New Covenant, there is no further need of shedding blood. As it is here said of the cup, *This cup is the New Testament in my blood*; so it it might be said of the cup of blood, (Exod. xxiv.,) *This cup is the Old Testament in the blood of Christ.* There all the articles of that covenant being read over, Moses sprinkled all the people with blood, and said, *This is the blood of the Covenant which God made with you;* and thus that the Old Covenant, or Testimony, was confirmed. In like manner, Christ, having published all the articles of the New Covenant, takes the cup of wine and gives them to drink; and saith, *This is the New Testament in my blood;* and thus the New Covenant was established."*

When sacrifice was offered, in ratification of a covenant between God and man, the Lord's portion of the sacrifice was consumed by fire; but of the remaining portion of the sacrifice, or if that were a holocaust of the meat-offering that followed, the offerers did eat, in token of amity being established between the parties, in virtue of the covenant. And when a covenant was made between man and man, it was followed by an interchange of presents, or by a feast, of which both parties partook, in token of established friendship—as in the cases of Abraham and Abimelech, of Abner and David.† Hence sacrifices were federal rites.

---

* Lightfoot's Works, vol. ii. p. 260—Hor. Heb. on Math. xxvi. 27.

† Compare Mede on the Christian Sacrifice, Cudworth's True Notion of the Lord's Supper, and Waterland on the Eucharist, c. 11.

The Passover was both a sacrifice and federal feast, and was an eminent type of Christ. It was instituted on the night prior to the deliverance of Israel from Egyptian bondage. The paschal lamb was slain, and offered to God with unleavened bread and bitter herbs. The immediate object in the first passover was, that the blood which was sprinkled upon the door-posts might be a token of the alliance between God and his people; upon seeing of which, the Lord passed by, and withheld from them the plague that destroyed the first-born of the Egyptians;—and it was appointed by an ordinance, that an annual feast of seven days should be kept for a *Sign* and for a *Memorial*.—And it was commanded, that when it should be enquired in after ages, "What meaneth this service? ye shall answer, It is the sacrifice of the Lord's Passover."

It was on the anniversary of this sacrifice that the Lord instituted the Holy Supper. The bread which he brake was part of the unleavened bread of the passover, and the wine he gave to the disciples had been provided for the same feast: they had been previously presented as an oblation to the Lord. Upon these two portions of the oblation, or sacrifice, which till then were the commemoration of Israel's deliverance from the bondage of Egypt, and from the plague that smote the Egyptian first-born, our Lord pronounced a blessing, and destined them thenceforth to be the memorial of his dying for the redemption of men. As the bread and the wine possessed a sacrificial character when used as the memorial of the passover, what reason have we to conclude that they were denuded of that character, by being destined to be no longer the memorial of the type, but of the antitype? In the sacrifice commemorative of the type, it was necessary to its being a type that the blood of the paschal lamb should be shed; but Christ, the antitype

and true Paschal Lamb, being *once offered to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself*, the shedding of blood for sin, therefore, necessarily ceased; and only the unbloody part of the passover sacrifice, viz. the bread and wine, was destined to be the memorial of our Lord's death.

A. D. 33.—*The Breaking of Bread*, accordingly, is the earliest name that we find applied to the Holy Supper in Scripture. This name simply indicates the substance used, and the act to which it was subjected, according to the institution, immediately after the invocation of blessing. It is recorded in Acts ii. 42, that the followers of Christ "continued steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers. The ancient Syriac version hath rendered it "in breaking the Eucharist." Breaking bread occurs in v. 46, and also in xx. 7, where the Syriac again renders it "breaking the Eucharist." This was done on the "first day of the week," on which it is added that Paul preached unto them.

A. D. 57.—*The Communion.*—The partaking together of this broken bread is naturally productive of Christian fellowship and communion with one another, as professing the same faith, and with their common Redeemer, in whom that faith is placed. Hence the Apostle asks, "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ; and the bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" Here the Apostle manifestly speaks of the efficacy and virtue of this sacrament, which are strikingly illustrative of its being a federal right; and, undoubtedly, the term here used to denote them, afterwards became an expressive name for the ordinance itself. It does not, however, appear that Communion, though of Scripture origin, was very

frequently used as a name for the Sacrament, till the end of the third and the beginning of the fourth century.

But many examples of its being so used at these periods, might be adduced from the canons of the provincial councils, and one from the general council of Nice, in A.D. 325.

A. D. 57.—There is now no name more frequently applied to the Sacrament of the Eucharist, than *The Lord's Supper*. It occurs in 1st Cor. xi. 20, where some are inclined to interpret it of the love feasts anciently observed by Christians; and doubtless it is in reference to them that some of the Fathers use the phrase, while others apply it to the Eucharist. Basil is the first that made this application, which did not become general till the fourth century.

The Lord's Table is another name for the same holy ordinance. It is to be met with in 1st Cor. x. 21, where it is contrasted with the table of devils. To eat of the table of devils is to eat of the things offered or sacrificed to devils; to eat of the table of the Lord is, in like manner, to eat of the oblations of bread and wine presented on his table.—This name has the same date with the former. Both relate to particular circumstances in the institution,—the one to the time, the other to the place.

Oblation and Sacrifice.—A. D. 57.—In the text last quoted, the Apostle contrasts the table of the Lord, and the table of devils, putting them in direct opposition to each other. "Ye cannot drink of the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils; ye cannot eat of the table of the Lord and the table of devils." He had just before said, "That the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils." The things sacrificed are, therefore, the same with the meat-offerings and drink-offerings, signified by the cup and table of devils. In like manner, the meat-

offerings and drink-offerings, signified by the cup and table of the Lord, were also sacrifices in the Apostle's estimation ; otherwise, the contrast he has instituted is greatly defective. As the meat-offerings and drink-offerings presented upon the table of devils were sacrifices, so were the bread and wine upon the table of the Lord ; and, consequently, these were called oblation or sacrifice—Προσφορα or Θυσια. The former corresponds to the generic Hebrew term Mencha, which includes sacrifice as well as any other kind of offering ; the latter, Zebeh, answers, in the Septuagint, to Θυσια, sacrifice. The verb of the same root signifies to slay in general, whether for sacrifice or for food,—but most frequently for sacrifice.

Romanists endeavour to bolster up the pretended sacrifice of the Mass, by insisting that Θυσια, sacrifice, necessarily implies the death of the victim ;—but it will be easy to shew that Θυσια is much more extensive in its signification than its Hebrew correspondent. For, besides the slaying of food, it often signifies offerings in general, and is thus synonymous with Προσφορα, oblation. In reply to the Romish plea, and in proof that Θυσια, sacrifice, has a general as well as special signification, it will be sufficient, at present, to mention Plato's definition of sacrifice : " To sacrifice is to make a present to the gods."*

In Acts xxiv. 17, Προσφορα signifies alms or gifts; and in Philipp. iv. 18, the same thing is denoted by Θυσια. It was already stated, that as the drink and meat-offerings, signified by the cup and table of devils, were idol sacrifices, so must the bread and wine, signified by the table and cup of the Lord, be regarded as a sacrifice, if we would

---

* Το Θυειν δωρεισθαι εσται τοις θεοις.—Plato in Euthyphron. P. 10.

maintain the congruity and conclusiveness of the Apostle's reasoning. Oblation and sacrifice are therefore names applicable to the sacramental bread and wine. But how they came to be thus used, and the sense in which they are applied, may be further illustrated, by considering what is said in Ephesians v. 2 ; " Christ loved us, and gave himself—Προσφορὰν καὶ Θυσίαν—an offering and a sacrifice for us." Here, the general term " offering," and the more specific term " sacrifice"—which has its meaning often restricted to that kind of offering made by the death of the victim—are both combined, to shew, that all that could, in the most extensive, or in the most minute sense, come under the name sacrifice, is comprehended and accomplished in the one great atoning sacrifice. And lest it should be supposed, that though oblation and sacrifice are combined to designate the sacrifice of Christ, but yet that each marks a special portion or relation of it, let it be further observed, that in Heb. x. 12, it is said, " Christ offered, μίαν Θυσίαν, one sacrifice for sins," which in the 14th v. is called, " μίαν Προσφορὰν, one offering, by which he perfected for ever them that are sanctified." Here the Lord's dying for our redemption is called an offering and sacrifice ; and the sense in which they are applied is expressly and positively limited by the word *one*. Christ died but *once ;* and therefore oblation and sacrifice implying death, must necessarily be restricted by *one*. Consequently, it can only be by metonymy that they are given to the bread and wine, which are the symbols whereby, according to the Lord's own appointment, his death is to be shewn forth. There was, in reality, but one actual Passover, namely, the Angel's passing by the Israelites, whilst he smote the Egyptians, and the deliverance from bondage next accomplished ; yet the festi-

val which the Jews celebrated annually for a *Sign* and *Memorial* of that great deliverance, obtained its name, and was called the Passover. In like manner, Christ offered but one sacrifice for sin ; yet, just as in the preceding case, the names oblation and sacrifice are applied to the sacramental service, in which the Lord's dying for our redemption is commemorated. What more appropriate name could be given to the memorial of our redemption, than that significative of the means by which it was accomplished ?

In this way, the application of the terms " oblation and sacrifice" to the sacramental bread and wine, may be satisfactorily explained, and the sense in which they are used be clearly determined. And since such a use of them is so natural, and so entirely scriptural, being implied or understood in 1st Cor. x. 16—21 ; and being strictly analogous to the language of inspiration respecting the Passover, we feel strongly persuaded that these are the causes which led to the use of them, rather than the unimportant circumstance, doctrinally speaking, that either lay or sacerdotal oblations preceded the celebration of the Sacrament in the Primitive Church. At the same time, there is no doubt but that these names were also applied to the gifts brought by the people, and to the minister's presentation of them upon the altar ; but this was only relatively, and by extension of their strict and principal meaning. Oblation and sacrifice were names assigned to the Eucharist in the first century,* and have continued to be so ever since.

But in the writings of many of the Fathers in the ancient Church, there are various expletive and qualifying adjuncts attached to them, which variety of combination most completely disproves the Romish pretence, that the natural body

---

* See the Epistles of Clemens and Ignatius.

of Jesus Christ is sacrificed every time the Sacrament is celebrated. Thus Augustine, on one occasion, combines sacrifice with the name of the object which the faithful contemplate in the Sacrament; and, accordingly, giving to the sign the name of the thing signified, calls it, "the sacrifice of Christ's body and blood, which men may receive, and yet be wicked."* It cannot be doubted, that bread and wine are here meant by Christ's body and blood, because the wicked are not partakers of Christ's mystical body.—Besides, to sacrifice is to give something unto God, not to receive. A parallel passage occurs in Cyprian's 63 Epistle. "The sacrifice that we offer is the passion of our Lord."—In both these examples, the sign is confounded with the thing signified—the memorial with the deed commemorated. Augustine, on another occasion, conjoins with sacrifice the names of the substances appointed to be the commemorative symbols of the sacrifice of the cross. "The holy Catholic Church offers continually to Christ, with the Father and the Holy Spirit, the *sacrifice* of bread and wine in faith and love."† Elsewhere, imitating the style of Paul, he omits all terms directly indicating or characterising the sacrifice of the cross, or the symbols by which it is commemorated, and joins to sacrifice the name of the place where the sacrament is dispensed, and calls it, "The oblation or sacrifice of the altar," which is exactly parallel to Paul's saying, "Ye cannot eat of the table of the Lord," &c. On the whole, then, it is most manifest, that the bread and wine are styled a sacrifice, because they are the signs of

---

* August. cont. Cresconius, apud Aubertin, p. 5.

† De Fide ad Petrum, c. 19.

Christ's sacrifice; according to the saying of Augustine, "That which is universally denominated sacrifice is the *Sign* of the true sacrifice."*

Had the bread and wine been a true sacrifice, either in themselves simply, or after being transubstantiated, as Romanists pretend,† how could the ancient Christians have answered the Jews and Pagans, who reproached them with having no sacrifices, as Justin Martyr does, saying, "That the prayers and thankgivings of believers and saints are the only perfect sacrifices and acceptable to God, and that they are the only sacrifices Christians have been taught to offer even when they celebrate the Eucharist?" Thus, then, they appear to have kept in mind the fundamental law of Evangelical worship—"God is a Spirit; and they that worship him, must worship him in spirit and in truth."

The apostle's exhortation to "present your bodies a *living* sacrifice"—Θυσια—(Rom. xii. 1.‡) embraces the entire sum of spiritual worship which Christians, considered as individuals, offer unto God. The Church or aggregate community of the faithful is likewise called a sacrifice or offering Προσφορα, (Rom. xv. 16; Isaiah, lxvi. 20; 1st Cor. x. 17.)—These sacrifices are styled *living*, partly, perhaps, in contra-distinction to the victims slain under the law, but chiefly because the subjects of them are regenerated, being born of the Spirit. They once were

---

* Illud quod omnibus appellatur sacrificium, Signum est veri sacrificii. De Civit. Dei, lib. x. c. 6.

† The Romanists, who maintain that the bread and wine are transubstantiated into Christ's body and blood, in order to be the sacrifice of his body and blood, must, if they would be consistent, maintain, likewise, that they are also transubstantiated back again into bread and wine, to be the sacrifice of bread and wine, and are also transubstantiated into the altar or table, to be the sacrifice of the altar.

‡ See Howe's Discourse upon this text.

"dead in sin," but now they are "alive to God through Jesus Christ their Lord." How does this appear? They being alive, present their "members" (faculties of mind and organs of body) as instruments of righteousness unto God. "This is their reasonable service," their rational and spiritual worship. These terms, "living sacrifice," "instruments of righteousness unto God," and "reasonable service," are all universals. "Reasonable service," comprehends every act of spiritual worship. These acts again are the graces and virtues consequent to being alive from the dead through Jesus, and constitute the offering of righteousness unto God. The WHOLE is termed a "living sacrifice." Sacrifice may, therefore, be affirmed of any of the *parts* included in that *whole*. This inference is corroborated by the practice of inspired writers. Thus the mental and spiritual exercises of "confessing unto God"—of praise and thanksgiving, (Heb. xiii. 15.)—are acts which relate to none else but God, and are spiritual sacrifices. The prayers of saints are evangelical incense or New Testament sacrifices. (Rev. v. 8—viii. 34; Malachi i. 2.) The broken and the contrite heart, from which these prayers proceed, is a sacrifice which the Lord will not despise. (Ps. li. 7.) Alms are spiritual sacrifices—obviously not the material part of them, for that goes to the use of man, but they are the outward manifestation of the charity of the heart, which disposition is a sacrifice well pleasing unto God. (Heb. xiii. 16; Acts, x. 4; Phil. iv. 18.) And that faith by which we, who were once dead, have our life now hid with Christ in God, is itself a sacrifice. (Phil. ii. 17.) One and all of these are sacrifices of righteousness, (Ps. iv. 5; Rom. vii. 13.) or, as the apostle Peter calls them, spiritual sacrifices. They are offered by believers generally, who are therefore designated

by Peter "a holy priesthood." All these gospel, immaterial, and spiritual sacrifices are comprehended and represented in the great, complicated, and most holy sacrifice of the Eucharist. The primitive Fathers, conforming to the style of scripture, used the term sacrifice in equal latitude as in Holy Writ. By metonymy they often applied it to the sacramental elements, but, at the same time, they held most unequivocally, that all the sacrifices in the Church of Christ, are immaterial and spiritual. Abundant evidence of this will be found in the following chronological narrative. Meantime, let me refer the reader to Justin Martyr's testimony, quoted above, and to the subjoined passages from the eloquent Chrysostom. "We have our victim, our priest, our sacrifice in heaven; let us present such sacrifices as can be offered in that sanctuary, not of sheep nor of oxen, not of blood nor of fat, as of old; all these things are abolished, and a reasonable service is introduced in their stead. And what is this reasonable service? The things which proceed from the soul, the things which proceed from the spirit;—God is a spirit, and they that worship him, must worship him in spirit and truth: every thing that does not need body, or organs, or place; as modesty, temperance, alms, tolerance, patience, and humility."* Having elsewhere said, "Christ always takes away sin without being always crucified," he assigns this reason, "for he offered ONE sacrifice for sin, but he purifieth us continually by this one sacrifice."†

A.D. 104.—*Sacrament.*—Sacrament is not a name of Scripture origin. The first writing in which it is found is Pliny's epistle to Trajan, where it is used in relation to the Lord's Supper. It was, very probably, used in a similiar

* Chrysost. Hom. xi. in c. 6, ad Heb. – † Chrysost. in Joan. Hom. 17.

way by Christians themselves; and, therefore, adopted by Pliny in writing concerning them. It is an appropriate name, as before remarked, for denoting that holy ordinance in which "Christ and the benefits of the new covenant are represented, sealed, and applied to believers." With this name, as with sacrifice, the Fathers have connected various expletives, which shew that it sometimes denotes the outward sign—sometimes the thing signified—and sometimes the whole service, including both the sign and thing signified.

It is, therefore, with them, often a term of general meaning. In many of its uses, it corresponds to those of the word sacrifice. Augustine says, "the *sacrifice* of his body is the *sacrament* of the faithful."* Parallel to a sentence formerly quoted, (p. 27,) he says, "A man may receive the sacrament of Christ's body and blood, and be wicked."† Elsewhere he uses bread and wine instead of body and blood, and says, "We are very far removed from the Pagan gods, Ceres and Bacchus, although, according to our mode, we embrace the sacrament of bread and of the cup."‡ In the former example, we have *Sacrament* applied to the thing signified, in the latter it is restricted to the *sign*,—its proper meaning. Imitating the style of Paul, in 1st Cor. x. 16, he says, "How many are there who partake of the *altar*, and die." For this reason, he declares, in the sentence preceding, that "the Sacrament is one thing, the virtue of the Sacrament another."§ Adopting the sentiment of the 17th verse, he says, "We are one bread and one body. —O Sacrament of piety! O sign of unity! O bond of love!"¶

---

* Epist. 120, c. 24.—† In I. Joan. Tract 7.—‡ Contr Faust. L. 20, c. 13.—§ In Joan. Tract. 26.—¶ In Joan. Tract. 26.

Cyprian calls the Eucharist "the Sacrament of the Cup;"* and, in another place, pointing to the event commemorated in the Eucharist, and the benefits it secured for man, he calls it "the Sacrament of the Lord's passion, and of our redemption."

Eucharist† is another name given to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and hath been much used in the church, from the apostolical age down to the present time. It properly signifies thanksgiving or blessing. It thus conveys nearly the same ideas as these scriptural expressions, "sacrifices of praise—spiritual sacrifices." It does not occur in Scripture as a name applied to the whole service of the Supper; yet the verb, which has the same derivation, is found in St. Matthew's account of the Institution. From denoting a part of the service, it very soon came to denominate the whole. After the example of our Lord, the primitive Christians began the celebration of this holy ordinance with blessing or giving of thanks, and concluded with singing a hymn. The whole service was therefore very appropriately called Eucharist. "Hence (saith Augustine,) we render thanksgiving to the Lord, our God, which is the great sacrament in the sacrifice of the New Testament."‡ And elsewhere, he asks, "What more sacred sacrifice of praise is there, than in the Thanksgiving or Eucharist, which is all that the faithful know in the sacrifice of the Church."§

Memorial.—Christ blessed the bread and brake it, and gave to the disciples, saying, "Do this in remembrance of me." Remembrance of Christ, therefore, is the principal duty enjoined in celebrating the Eucharist. Hence, *Memorial* came to be employed as a general appellation of

---

* De Lapsis, p. 189.—† See Ignatius, 1st cent.—‡ Epist. 120, c. 19, apud Aubertin.—§ Contr. Adv. Leg. et Proph. L. i. c. 18.

this holy ordinance. It appears to have been thus used, first, by Justin Martyr, afterwards by Cyprian, Origen, Eusebius, &c.

A.D. 249.—*Passover.*—The Old Testament Passover was an eminent type of our deliverance from spiritual bondage, by Christ's obedience unto the death of the cross.—"Christ, our Passover, is sacrificed for us." The annual Paschal feast, celebrated under the Jewish economy, was a commemorative feast. Keeping this in view, we shall the more easily understand Nazianzen's saying, "We shall partake of the Passover, which even now is but a *type*, though a much plainer than the *old* one; for I am bold to say, that the legal Passover was an obscurer *type* of another *type*."* Wherefore, the Passover we eat is a *type* or *sign* of Christ's broken body and shed blood. On this account Chrysostom says, that "Our Passover is to declare the Lord's death."† In another place, he calls the Eucharist the "Spiritual Passover."‡

There have been various other names of less note given to the Lord s Supper, such as "our price," "the cup of our price," "the sacrifice of our price," "sacrament of our price." The Africans, who thought there was no salvation without partaking of the Holy Supper, called it *Life*.

The controversy between Protestants and Romanists about the Eucharist comprehends various particulars; but the two principal contested points regard the *subject* and *object* of the Eucharistical sacrifice. Protestants, adhering rigidly to the words of our Lord and apostles, maintain, that the *subject* of the Eucharistical sacrifice, is bread and wine,

---

* Nazianzen Orat. 52.—† Chrysost. Orat. Cont. Jud. 3.

‡ Chrys. de prodit Jud. Hom. I.—See Aubertin De la creance, de l'Eglisse, and Waterland on the Eucharist, p. 53.

consecrated by prayer and thanksgiving: "Jesus took bread, and blessed it; and he took the cup, and gave thanks."—Romanists hold, that the living, true, and glorified body of Jesus Christ, is sacrificed and slain under the species or appearance of bread and wine, and eaten after a corporal and carnal manner. Protestants believe, that the *object* of the oblation is to commemorate the all-sufficient atonement Jesus made for sin, by the sacrifice he offered of himself once unto God. Romanists believe the *object* of the oblation they imagine they offer, is to make continual propitiation for the sins of the quick and the dead. The chief reasons the latter have for their opinions, is the decree of Pope Innocent III. in the Council of Lateran, A.D. 1215, and the still more definite declaration of the Council of Trent. The words of Scripture, and the language of the Fathers who wrote prior to the close of the twelfth century, are attempted to be construed, so as to corroborate the decrees of the above named Councils. The errors and absurdities involved in the doctrine intended to be established by these decrees, are admirably exposed and refuted in Du Moulin's Anatomy of the Mass. But it may be of advantage for the reader, first to obtain a historical view of the opinions entertained by the Fathers respecting the two principal contraverted points, namely, whether the faithful are partakers of consecrated bread and wine in the sacrament, or whether they receive the substance of the true, glorified, and newly slain body of Jesus Christ; or secondly, whether the Sacrament of the Holy Supper be a rite, making continual propitiation for sin, and, by physical means, producing spiritual life; or whether it be an ordinance, whereby commemoration is made of the atonement Christ made for sin, once for all, when he said, "It is finished;" and by spiritual efficacy invigorating spiritual life.

Let us attend to the testimony of the Fathers.

Cent. I.—Our Lord blessed the bread before he brake it. After his death, his disciples "continued stedfastly in the apostles' doctrine, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers." The Vulgate renders it thus, "They continued in the doctrine of the apostles, and in the communication of the breaking of bread and prayer." And the Syriack thus, "They persevered in the doctrine of the apostles, and communicated in prayer, and in breaking the Eucharist."* The consecrated bread is here named Eucharist.

Clemens Romanus, in his epistle to the Corinthians, several times designates the Lord's Supper an *oblation*, and the other parts of the worship *liturgy*. "We ought to celebrate the oblations and divine services (Προσφορας και λειτουργιας) on appointed times."

Ignatius, in writing to the Smyrnians, uses both oblation and sacrifice. "It is not lawful to baptise, to offer, or to sacrifice, or to accomplish the feast without a bishop."† To offer, here signifies to present the sacramental elements on the Holy Table,—to sacrifice, to consecrate them to be the memorial of Christ's sacrifice—and to accomplish the feast denotes the communicants' participation of the consecrated food. He calls the whole action, of which these are the component parts, "the Eucharist and glory of God." In another place he calls it the "bread of God," which is "the one bread, communicants break." This action accompanied with "the prayers of the bishop, and the whole church, is a sacrifice, from which if any separate himself, he is a wolf in sheep's clothing."‡ We find a passage somewhat similar in the Clementine Constitutions. "You,

---

* Mede. Works, p. 364.

† Bishop and Presbyter, were, at this period, interchangeable terms.

‡ Ignat. ad Ephes. Bib. Pat. 41.

O, Bishops! are now unto your people as Priests and Levites, standing before the altar of the Lord our God, offering to him *reasonable* and *unbloody sacrifices*, through Jesus Christ the High Priest."

Cent. II.—About A.D. 150, Justin Martyr addressed an apology for the Christians to the Emperor Antoninus Pius, in which he saith: "After the minister has given thanks, and the people applauded (in praise), those whom we call deacons or servants give to all present, that they may partake of bread and wine, and this food we call the Eucharist; for we do not take these as common bread, nor as a common cup." And again: "Our flesh and blood are nourished by the mutation of this food, and we have said it is the flesh and blood of Jesus Christ." But he rejects the idea of any *material oblation*. For, "We have been taught that God has no need of any *material oblation* from men, well knowing, that he is the giver of all things; but we are instructed, and persuaded, and do believe, that he accepts those only who copy after his moral perfections, purity, righteousness, love to men, and whatsoever things are like God." Justin, therefore, declares that "prayers and thanksgivings are the only sacrifices Christians have been taught to offer in memorial of their food, dry and liquid, wherein is likewise commemorated the passion the Son of God suffered by himself."

In the dialogue with Tryphon the Jew, we meet with the following passage regarding the object of the Eucharist, "Christ hath taught us that the Eucharistical bread should be consecrated for a *commemoration* of his *passion*, (εις αναμνησιν του Παθους,) that withal we may give thanks to God for having made the world with all things therein, for man, and for having delivered us from the evil and misery wherein we were."

We take the testimony of Irenaeus next. It corresponds with Justin's. Speaking of the sacramental bread, he saith, "The bread, which is of the earth, receiving the invocation of God, is now not common bread, but the Eucharist, consisting of two parts, the earthly and the heavenly."* The earthly part is the substance of bread, the heavenly part is the spiritual purpose to which it hath been set apart by consecration. If the bread were transubstantiated into Christ's body, it would be all heavenly. And, again, "Jesus hath affirmed, that the cup, which is a creature, is his blood; and that the bread, which is a creature, is his body.—When, therefore, the cup and bread receive the word, or invocation, of God—that is, are consecrated—they become the Eucharist, of Christ's body and blood, by which the substance of our flesh is supported and increased."† If the bread and wine are transubstantiated, as Romanists pretend, then Christ's body becomes part of our body; and, therefore, like our bodies, must be subject to corruption. The material creatures, according to Irenaeus, were *types* by which God was agnized.‡ The act of agnition is a true gospel sacrifice; for he assures us, that "God does not require sacrifices and holocausts for our salvation, but faith, obedience, and righteousness."§ The gospel incense, spoken of in Malachi i. 11, he interprets to mean "prayers of saints."¶ (Rev. v. 8;) and by "pure offerings" he understands "alms." The sacrifices of the Christian Church, therefore, in his estimation, were *spiritual.*

Cent. III.—In the writings of Clemens Alexandrinus, we find various spiritual sacrifices particularised. To the question, what constitutes an acceptable offering unto the

---

* L iv. c. xxxiv.—† L. v c. xii.—‡ L. iv. c. xvii.—§ L iv. c. xvii.—¶ Iren. ibid.

Lord? he replies, "a heart that glorifies its Maker is a sacrifice of sweet odour unto God."* In conformity with this general principle, he regards those virtues, which proceed from a renewed heart, namely, "meekness, philanthropy, piety, humility, and sound knowledge,"† as sacrifices that are pleasing to God. So, in his estimation, are "prayers, praises, psalms, and anthems."‡ Again, he says, "the sacrifice of the Church is an oration, exhaled from sanctified souls, while the whole mind is laid open before God, along with the sacrifice."§ These are sufficient evidence that this author constantly accounted the sacrifices in the Christian Church *spiritual.*

The next in order is Tertullian, a writer of considerable note. From his works many evidences might be produced that the Church, in his time, offered only spiritual sacrifices. Writing to Scapula, governor of Africa, to dissuade him from persecuting the Christians,—amongst other arguments, he urges this: "we likewise offer sacrifices for his (the Emperor's) safety, but they are sacrifices of prayer; for God, the Creator of the universe, does not stand in need of incense, or of the blood of any, for these are the food of demons." But does God need bread and wine any more than incense or blood? Tertullian could, therefore, regard these only as signs or types to which the name sacrifice was figuratively given. "Christ (says he, in his book against the Jews,) calls the bread his body." But though so called, it still remained bread. Had Tertullian imagined it to be substantially changed, he must have perceived that his argument against the Marcionites—who taught, that the body of Jesus was only a shadowy form—was utterly devoid of

---

* Clemen. Alex. Paedag. L. iii. c. 12.—† Clem. Alex. Strom. vii.—‡ Ibid.—§ Ibid.

force. Here is a specimen of his argument: "But Christ, having taken bread, and distributed it among his disciples, made it his body, saying, This is my body, that is a *figure* of my body. But there would have been no *figure*, had there not been a true body; for a vacuity, as a phantom is, can have no *figure*." If Tertullian had held the doctrine of transubstantiation, would not the Marcionites have retorted, you happily illustrate our opinion? After the bread and wine are consecrated, their substances are abolished, while their sensible qualities remain—*i.e.* a shadowy form remains. In like manner, Jesus possessed only a spiritual substance; for though, in appearance, he had a human body, it was only a shadowy form. Whoever, indeed, believes in transubstantiation is, by his principles, rendered incapable of proving the truth of Christ's human nature. Referring to the prediction of the Christian sacrifice in Malachi, he interprets the "pure offering," not of any material oblation, "but of earnest prayer, from a pure conscience."*—Tertullian, indeed, plainly rejects material sacrifices.—"That we ought not to offer unto God *earthly* but spiritual sacrifices, we may learn from what is written: 'The sacrifice of God is an humble and contrite spirit:' and elsewhere, 'offer unto God the sacrifice of thanksgiving, and pay thy vows to the Most High.'"† So, then, the *spiritual* sacrifices of praise are here referred to, and a troubled spirit is declared to be the acceptable sacrifice unto God.

We shall add only one other passage from this Father. It is to be found in his Book of Prayer, and is considered, by the learned Dr. Waterland, to be a good description of the Eucharistical sacrifice. When shewing the inferiority

---

* Tertul. Contr. Marc. L. iv. c. 1.—† Tertul. adv. Jud. c. 5.

of the legal to gospel sacrifices, he says, "we are the true worshippers and the true priests; who, worshipping in spirit, do in spirit *sacrifice prayer*, suitable to God, and acceptable; such as he has required, and such as he has provided for himself. This is what we ought to bring to God's altar, by way of sacrifice, devoted from the whole heart—fed with faith—decked with truth—made entire by innocence, and clean by chastity—crowned with a feast of charity—attended with a train of good works, amidst the acclamations of psalms and anthems."*

Origen entertained the same sentiments respecting the spirituality of the Christian sacrifices, as the earlier Fathers had done. The arguments Tertullian had used against the Marcionites, were urged anew by him. "The Sacrament, (he says,) is meat sanctified by the word of God, and by prayers,—the *material* part of which goes into the draught."† In the book against Celsus, after referring to the offerings the Pagans made unto demons, he says, "we have also a symbol of our thanksgiving unto God—the bread which is called Eucharist." Again: "we eat the bread that was offered unto God, with prayer and thanksgiving for his gifts, and then made a *kind* of holy body by prayer." Comparing the Eucharist to the shew bread, which was placed before the Lord every Sabbath for a memorial, he asserts, "that the Eucharist is the only *commemoration* which renders God *propitious* to man."‡ This is well illustrated by Augustine. "*Faith* having received these things which Christ exhibits in his supper, interposeth them as a *satisfaction and propitiation*

---

* Tertul. de Orat. c. xxvii. 28 —† Orig. in Math. xv.—‡ Orig. Homil. xiii. on Levit. c. 24; compare Waterland on the Euch. p. 51.

between ourselves and God's wrath."* Prayers and thanksgiving are, therefore, the spiritual sacrifices which "Christ, the propitiation for our sins," is implored to present unto his Father.†

Our next author, Cyprian, is often quoted, by Romanists, as being a decided transubstantiator. The following is the passage they find in his writings, most to their purpose. "If Jesus Christ, our Lord and God, be the High Priest of God the Father, and first offered Himself a sacrifice to the Father, and commanded 'This to be done in commemoration of Himself,' then that Priest truly acts in Christ's stead, who imitates what Christ did, and then offers a true and complete sacrifice in the church to God, the Father, if he begins to offer according as he sees Christ to have offered before." This is the boasted testimony. Yet, there is not one word in it about corporal presence.—I know the emphasis is laid upon, "He commanded *this* to be done;" and it is thence inferred, that, as Christ sacrificed himself, communicants must also sacrifice him: but the inference is most false. For, if we are to do exactly as he did, then, as he sacrificed himself, so must we sacrifice—not *him*, but—ourselves; and the only way we can do this, is, as a "holy priesthood," to offer ourselves living—that is, spiritual—sacrifices. Did Christ sacrifice *himself* in *commemoration* of *himself?* Or did he not command us (as Cyprian teaches) to *commemorate* him, by imitating his example in celebrating the Holy Supper which he instituted. Great stress is also laid upon the words, *true* and *complete* sacrifice. But what proof is this for corporal presence? Can a spiritual sacrifice be neither true nor complete? Christ

---

* Aug. Civ. Dei. L. ix. c. 13.—† Orig. Contr. Cels. p. 751.

could be offered by none but himself. He offered himself verily and wholly unto God: so must we offer ourselves "living sacrifices," truly and completely. Thus, as priests, may we act in Christ's stead, imitating what he did. Yet, perhaps, Cyprian meant nothing more than that both bread and wine should be used in the Eucharist; and thus insinuating, that the Aquarians, who rejected the use of wine, were guilty of mutilating the institution of the Lord. That Cyprian believed the bread and wine to be the material substance of the Eucharistical Sacrifice, and that they are significant of Christ's body, is evident from the following passage: "At the table where our Lord partook of the last feast with his apostles, he gave the bread and wine with his own hands; but he gave his own body to be wounded on the cross, by the hands of the soldiers, that the pure verity and perfect sincerity impressed upon the apostles, might shew to the Gentiles in what manner the bread and wine were his flesh and blood, and by what means causes accord with effects, and different names or species are referred to one essence; that the things signifying may be called by the name of things signified."* Thus the bread and wine which Christ gave, were significant of the body and blood that were afterwards to be offered on the cross. Cyprian held, as decidedly as any of his predecessors, that the Christian sacrifices are spiritual. Writing to the imprisoned confessors, who were denied the privilege of communicating, he says: "Neither your religion, nor your faith, can suffer by the hardships you endure; and that the priests of God have not liberty to offer and celebrate the holy sacrifices.—You do celebrate and offer unto God a sacrifice both

---

* Cyprian lib de Unctione.

precious and glorious, and which will greatly promote your success in obtaining heavenly rewards. The Holy Scripture says: The sacrifice of God is a broken spirit; a broken and a contrite heart, God doth not despise. (Ps. li. 17.) This sacrifice you offer to God, this you celebrate without intermission day and night, being made victims to God, and presenting yourselves as such, holy and unblemished, pursuant to the apostle's exhortation; where he says: I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, (Rom. xii. 1.) for this is what pleases God; and it is this by which our sacrifices are rendered *more worthy*, for obtaining the divine acceptance. This is the *only thing* that our devout and dutiful affections can offer, under the name of a return, for all his great and salutary blessings." From this it is manifest, that Cyprian believed that when the faithful were, from uncontrolable circumstances, prevented from celebrating the Holy Communion, they still retained the liberty of offering a more acceptable sacrifice, by devoting of themselves to God.

That Cyprian conceived that the Eucharistical bread and wine were used for *commemorating* Christ's death, is evident from his epistle to Caecilius, in which he reprehends the then novel practice of some who used water in the sacrament instead of wine. "That cup which is offered (viz. to the people) in commemoration of Christ, must, contrary to the opinion of the Aquarians, be offered mixed. For when the wine is not in the cup, the blood of Christ is not *represented;* because we think that the blood of Christ is shewn by *wine*, as the people are understood by *water*." This single brief passage contains a complete refutation of all that Romanists can adduce from Cyprian for the support of their cause. What further evidences that the Eucharist

is a *memorial*, or ordinance of commemoration, is, that towards the end of this century, it was celebrated at the tomb of the martyrs. Cyprian, in a letter to his clergy, requests them to inform him of the day when any of the persecuted and imprisoned Christians were put to death, "that he might offer sacrifices in remembrance of them." Hence, these sacrifices were not propitiatory—the martyrs being already blessed—but commemorative; being the celebration of their martyrdom. It is a most daring impiety to pretend to sacrifice Christ in memorial of himself—how much more awfully impious is it to propose to sacrifice Jesus for a memorial of any human being, how holy soever, or how nobly soever he had borne his testimony to the faith once delivered unto the saints. Cyprian did not even permit praying for the dead. In a letter to the clergy and people of Furni, refusing to one Victor the *post-mortem* honours—namely, the performing the Eucharist at his tomb on the anniversary of his martyrdom—he says: "they ought not *to pray for him after his death.*" The Communion was celebrated at the tombs of martyrs, that the minds of the receivers being aroused by the recollection of the heroic faith and the noble fortitude of those who had braved even the terrors of death, and now lay sleeping in their sepulchres,—they might, with more devotedness and more ardent love, commemorate the death of the Lord, who had sustained the martyrs, and enabled them to fight the good fight of faith, and to finish their course with joy.

Cent. IV.—The first document we find in this century, bearing upon our subject, is a Canon of the Council of Nice. Romanists were wont to refer to it as an irrefragable proof that the Nicean Fathers held the same opinions concerning the Eucharist as they did themselves; but Protestants assert, that they not only find nothing in it repugnant

to the reformed doctrine, but even contend that it contains satisfactory evidence that the divines who framed it maintained Protestant sentiments on this subject. In justice, therefore, to our readers, and the contending parties, we place before them a literal translation of Bellarmine's version of this Canon, taken from the Vatican Library.—"Moreover, we are not to think too meanly of the bread and the cup on the holy table; but raising the mind, we must, by faith, discern the Lamb of God taking away the sins of the world, placed upon the sacred table, sacrificed unbloodily by the priests; and partaking verily of his precious body and blood, believing them to be the symbols of our resurrection. For this reason, we take but a small portion, that we may know that they are offered, not for satiating, but for sanctifying."* We make no comment, but simply add, that Luther and Calvin approve of this Canon: and Bucer saith, "so I think in the Lord; and I wish to appear in this mind before the tribunal of God—*Mea manu.*"

Eusebius of Caesarea hath been cited by Romanists as a witness for their doctrine of transubstantiation. In his fifth homily he, no doubt, says, "the substance of bread is present, but after consecration, it is the body of Christ."—But, elsewhere, he explains in what manner it is the body of Christ. "Our Lord himself gave the *symbols* of the divine economy to his disciples, commanding them to make the *image* of his own body."† What is meant by this "image of his body," the following passage will shew:—"The bread and wine signify the mystery of his body and blood.‡ The venerable sacrifices of Christ's table, in the

---

* Bellar. de Euch. L. ii. c. 10.—† Euseb. Demon. L. viii. c. 1.—‡ Ibid. L. v. c. 3.

ministering of which we are taught to offer to the supreme God, during our whole lives, the *unbloody*, *spiritual*, and, to Him, most acceptable sacrifices, through the High Priest, who is above all."* He calls them also "*incorporeal* and *spiritual* sacrifices,—which are prayers, praises, and a contrite heart." Referring to Malachi's prophecy, (chap. i. 11,) "We offer, therefore, unto the most high God, the sacrifice of praise: we offer, after a new way, according to the New Testament, the pure sacrifice; for the sacrifice of God is said to be a contrite spirit." And, thereafter, he concludes with this admirable and pointed summary of Christian sacrifices, as comprehended in the great and complicated Eucharistical sacrifice: "Therefore, we offer both sacrifice and incense: first celebrating the memorial of the grand sacrifice, by those mysteries which He has ordained; and presenting thanksgivings for our salvation, by holy hymns and prayers:—then we offer up ourselves to Him, and to the Word, (John i. 1.)—his High Priest resting upon Him both with body and soul. Whereupon we endeavour to preserve to Him our bodies pure and untainted from all filthiness, and to bring Him minds free from all evil affections and stain of maliciousness; and take care to honour Him by purity of thought, sincerity of affection, and soundness of principles: for these, we are taught, are more acceptable to Him than a multitude of sacrifices streaming with blood, and smoke, and nidor."† It is here to be noticed, that Eusebius clearly distinguishes between Christ's sacrifice of himself, and the Eucharistical sacrifice by which it is commemorated. He calls the former "the *grand* sacrifice, which was not our's, but

---

* Enseb. Demon. L. x. c. 10.—† Euseb. Demonst. Evang. L. i. c. 10, quoted by Waterland, on the Euch. p. 520.

Christ's; and the latter the memorial, which is our sacrifice." The material symbols are bread and wine, which, by consecration, become the mysteries he ordained. But, being corporeal, they are not the sacrifice; for he asserts, that the sacrifice is *unbloody, incorporeal, and spiritual*, and gives an enumeration of the several parts of it in the remainder of the paragraph. It need only further be observed, that the epithet unbloody, is given to prayers by authors* of the period referred to; and that Eusebius elsewhere teaches that the *unbloody* sacrifices will be offered to God, both in this present life and also in that which is to come. They, therefore, cannot signify the material symbols of the Eucharist.

A.D. 330.—Athanasius likewise speaks of the Eucharist being Christ's body and blood; but whether he meant this to be understood in a corporal sense, will appear from the following passage in his treatise on speaking blasphemy against the Son of Man and the Holy Ghost: "The Lord distinguishes the spirit from the flesh, that we might learn that the things which he said are not *carnal* but spiritual. For, to how many could his body have sufficed for food? Could it afford aliment for the whole world? But he spoke of his ascension into heaven, for this reason, that he might withdraw them from the *corporal sense*, and that, therefore, they might understand his flesh, of which he spoke, to be food from above,—the celestial and spiritual food about to be given by himself: For the words I speak unto you are spirit and life; which is just as if he had said, My body, which is manifested, and is given for the world, shall be given for food to whomsoever it is spiritually bestowed,

---

* Sozom. L. ii. c. 15; Greg of Nyss. de Penit. p. 170; Waterland, p. 521.

and be made to each of them preservation to the resurrection unto eternal life." Transubstantiators, not knowing how the force of this testimony might be evaded, it occurred to Baronius, the annalist, to reject the whole treatise as spurious; but the learned and candid Romanist, Du Pin, acknowledges its genuineness and authenticity to be indisputable.

A.D. 350.—Hilary, bishop of Poictiers, is cited by Du Pin, as having written an excellent passage concerning the real presence, according to the sense in which that expression is understood by Romanists, namely, transubstantiation. In the eighth book on the Trinity, Hilary says, "that by this Sacrament we truly receive the flesh and blood of Jesus Christ, who remains corporally in us."* But if this is to be regarded as a proof of transubstantiation, then every baptised person is also transubstantiated into the body of Christ. For Hilary says, "because there is one baptism for Christians, therefore, they who are made one by baptism, are one in *nature*."† Moreover, Hilary entertained a notion similar to what some of the heretics of this country are said to be propounding at present in their coteries, namely, that there is some physical and corporal connexion formed in the sacrament, between the body of Christ and the bodies of communicants. But such an opinion, as the Jesuit Saurez very justly observes, is "not only improbable, but is rash, absurd, and repugnant to the dignity and majesty of this sacrament, which was instituted by Christ, not for a corporal, but spiritual conjunction, saying, My word is spirit and life."‡

Our opponents are wont to refer, with an air of triumph,

---

* See Coventry's Strictures on the Mass, p. 244.—† Hilary de Trin. L. viii.—‡ Saurez. Tom. iii. Quest. 79, Disp. 64, Sect. 3.

to the works of Cyril of Jerusalem, not only as a great authority upon the point under discussion, but as a supporter of several Romish doctrines and customs.* Bellarmine avers, that the testimony of Cyril alone ought to suffice,—that it is clear, plain, and cannot be perverted. Allowing his evidence to be as Bellarmine describes it, yet, it would be difficult to discover, why it should be allowed to supersede the Scriptures, and three centuries and a half of the Primitive Church's history. According to Bellarmine, Cyril says, "you must account it as most certain, that this bread, which we see is not bread, although the taste discern it to be bread, yet it is the body of Christ." If the sentence be understood literally, a more absurd one was never penned, for it requires a proposition to be believed, unsupported by any evidence, and contradicted both by the sense of sight and taste. But, Cyril's meaning, if he may be supposed to have been consistent with himself, probably was, that though sight and taste perceive nothing in the Eucharistical bread different from common bread, yet it is to be esteemed holy bread, consecrated to be a memorial of Christ's body.—Bellarmine further alleges, from Cyril, "that under the species of bread his body is given, and his blood under the species of wine." He ought to have done Cyril the justice of saying, "under the type of bread—Εν τυπω αρτου."†—Again, "do not think that ye taste the bread and the wine, but the antitype of his body and blood." But as a thing cannot be the type or antitype of itself, the type, therefore, could not be the body, but was merely the symbol of the body. Cyril says, "we repeat sacred hymns to the Trinity,

---

* Du Pin's History of Eccles. Authors, 4th cent.—† Cyril Catech. Mystagog. 4.

that we may become fitter to pray to God that he would send down his Holy Spirit upon the things we offer unto him, that the bread may become the body of Christ, and the wine his blood ; for whatsoever receives the impression of the Holy Spirit is sanctified and changed." Changed does not mean transubstantiated ; but, from being common, was made holy by the sanctification of the Spirit. But it is manifest, from the way in which Cyril commenced his observations, that he expected to be *spiritually* understood. " Christ Jesus said unto the Jews, Unless ye eat my flesh, and drink my blood, ye have no life in you. But these gross and carnal men, not understanding these words *spiritually*, were offended with them, and withdrew from him, because they imagined he wished them to eat human flesh by morsels." Those, therefore, according to Cyril's argument, who did not take offence, understood our Lord's words spiritually. After the sacrament service is finished, he concludes his account thus : " Now, when this spiritual sacrifice is ended, and this unbloody worship, which is given to God through the expiatory victim, is concluded, we then pray," &c. The human body of Jesus is not spiritual, neither is the spiritual sacrifice nor the *unbloody* worship the expiatory victim, but they are offered to God through the expiatory victim, who is our High Priest in heaven.

Speaking of the oil wherewith the newly-baptized were wont to be anointed, Cyril says, " Ye must not think that it is any longer common oil : for, as the bread in the Eucharist, after the invocation of the Holy Spirit, is no longer common bread, but the body of Christ ; so the oil is no longer common oil, but the gift of the grace of Christ, which has the virtue of procuring the presence of the divinity. So, while the whole body is anointed with oil, the soul is

sanctified by the Spirit."* The oil does not, by consecration, lose its own substance, nor is it transubstantiated into the gift of the grace of Christ; neither can it possibly be, for grace is a purely spiritual gift; neither does the bread, by consecration, lose its own substance, and pass into the body of Christ. The phrase, "no longer common bread," implies, that it is still bread, but is to be characterised by a different epithet. The parallelism between the oil and bread is complete. The oil, by consecration, becomes holy oil, which, being applied to the body, signifies the sanctifying of the soul by the quickening Spirit, through the grace of Christ;—common bread, by consecration, becomes sacred bread, which, when broken, distributed, and eaten, signifies Christ's body, wounded and bruised for our iniquities, and our reception of him, by faith, as the Lord our righteousness.

Basil is usually cited as a witness for transubstantiation, because he calls "the bread Christ's body;" but his Liturgy contains this petition: "May we all partake of one bread and of one cup."† But participation is after consecration; it was, therefore, still bread that the faithful received.

Gregory Nazianzen calls the Eucharist an "unbloody sacrifice, whereby we do communicate with Christ."‡ The unbloody sacrifice being the medium of communion with Christ, is not Christ. He likewise calls the unbloody sacrifices the *antitypes*, and contrasts them and the altar on which they are offered, with the "altar of the mind's contemplation in heaven, where sacrifices are offered as much more acceptable than those offered on the altar below, as the

---

* Mystagog. 3.—† Liturg. Basilii. Biblioth. Patrum.—‡ Greg. Nar. Invec. I. against Julian.

truth excels the shadow."* Christ, therefore, is not offered on the altar, for his sacrifice was infinite in excellence. The two things contrasted are, the symbolical, and the real or spiritual sacrifices—namely, the outward commemoration of the Lord's death at his holy table, and the spiritually offering ourselves living sacrifices to the God of heaven.

Gregory of Nyssa, a married bishop,† and brother to Basil, is usually objected to us; because, when comparing the body of Christ to manna, which satisfied every man's taste, he says: "The body of Christ is changed into whatsoever seemeth desirable or suitable to the appetite;—into herbs for the weak,—into milk for the young," &c.‡ By this hyperbolical language, we understand Gregory to mean, that the faithful, of every condition, may derive spiritual sustenance from the Holy Supper. But it makes against the Romanists every way; for, if the Eucharistical bread be transubstantiated at all, it must be into herbs or milk, or whatever else may seem desirable to the recipients. Bellarmine quotes the same Father, as saying, "that the body of Christ, entering into our bodies, changes them into itself."§ This must be understood spiritually, for if that change means transubstantiation, then are men's bodies transubstantiated into the body of Christ.

From the time of Cyprian, when important changes took place in the form of ecclesiastical government, corruptions and superstititions began rapidly to increase. The most fertile source of error and profanity, was the preposterous desire of imitating the rites of Pagans, and blending them with the worship of Christians. To this cause are we in-

---

* Greg. Naz. Orat. 28.—† Du Pin's Eccles. Authors.—‡ Greg Nyss. Lib. de vita Moses, p. 509.—Coventry's Strictures on the Mass, p. 143.

debted for the word Mass,—the use of which, among the Pagans, was to intimate the dismissal of the uninitiated from the temple, before the idolatrous mysteries were performed. When it was first appropriated by Christians, it signified the dismission of the Catchumens, before the celebration of the Holy Supper.

Ambrose, whose opinion regarding the Eucharist comes next to be examined, is the most ancient author whom Bellarmine alleges as having used the word Mass; but the sense in which he used it was very different from its modern Romish acceptation. We find Ambrose speaking of the consecrated elements, by the name of "broken bread."—"He gave broken bread to his disciples, saying, Take," &c.* But then it is objected that he saith, that "the bread is changed to another thing;"† that it "becomes the flesh of Christ;"‡ and that "we offer an immaculate unbloody host."§ We shall allow Ambrose to be his own interpreter. The bread is called the body of Christ, because, "after consecration, it *signifies* the body of Christ,"¶—and "the mystery is, the type of his blood." If we read the whole sentence, where the phrase "immaculate host" occurs, we shall find it to be something distinct from the material part of the Eucharist. "Therefore, remembering his most glorious passion, we offer to Thee this immaculate, unbloody host—(This is the spiritual service; then follows the material part)—and this holy bread, and this oblation of eternal salvation."‖ This oblation he elsewhere explains to be "an image of Christ,"** which "we, indeed, offer up in remembrance of his saving death."††

---

* Amb. de Sacr. L. iv. c. 5.—† Amb. de Myst. et de Sacr. L. iv. c. 4.—‡ Amb. cited by Bellar. de Euch. L. ii. c. 14.—§ Amb. de Sacr. L. iv. c. 14.—¶ Ibid.—‖ Ibid.—** Amb. de Officius, L I. c. 48.—†† Amb. in Heb. x.

Observe, also, how he explains the *change* he spoke of. "The bread becomes, by consecration, not what nature formed, but what the blessing hath consecrated:"* that is, the common bread hath become holy or sacramental bread, as is evident from the following ample illustration: "Perhaps you will say, my bread is common bread; but what is mere bread before the sacramental words—when consecration hath been added, from bread it becomes the body of Christ." May we, therefore, add by what means that which is bread can be the body of Christ,—it is by consecration. "Consecration is performed in the words of the Lord, that the venerable sacrament may be completely perfected. You see how effective the word of Christ is. If, therefore, there was so much power in the word of the Lord, that the things which were not began to be, how much more effective in causing those things which were to *remain*, and yet to be changed into another thing? Therefore, that I may answer you,—the bread was not the body of Christ before consecration; but now, after consecration, it is the body of Christ. He said, and it was done. Thou wast, but wast an old creature; but thou wast consecrated, and didst begin to be a new creature."—The change produced by consecration is, in the conclusion of the above passage, likened to the change that takes place in regeneration, of which baptism is the outward sign. In regeneration the change is spiritual, not corporal; in like manner the bread and wine, by consecration, become the emblems of spiritual nourishment.

Epiphanius, bishop of Salamis, hath been cited both for and against the doctrine of the mass, by the contending parties. Bellarmine thinks he finds convincing proof that

---

* Amb. lib. de Myst. c. 9.

Epiphanius held the doctrine of transubstantiation in his treatise, entitled Anchoratus, in which he enquires wherein consists the image of God, in the likeness of which man was made. He endeavours to distinguish between the image and the nature of God, and selects the Eucharist as an illustration of the distinction, saying, "as the Eucharist has a certain resemblance to the Saviour, so also the image of the Godhead had a certain resemblance to the nature of the Godhead." Now it could never enter into the imagination of Epiphanius, or any other man, that in the image man received at his creation, he received the nature of the very Godhead; neither then could he hold that communicants, by receiving the Eucharist, which is the image of Christ, into their mouths, were, by that act, receiving the *very nature*, human and divine, of Jesus Christ. This, I apprehend, to be pretty clear evidence against the Romish mass sacrifice. Du Pin is far from adopting the insupportable position of Bellarmine, and acknowledges that Epiphanius speaks very obscurely on the subject; but still thinks that he says as much as to shew, that he believed in the corporal presence, and sacrifice of Christ in the mass: whereas, the learned Scultetus maintains, that our author held the diametrically opposite opinion; and one of the grounds upon which he does so is, that Epiphanius taught, "that Christ abolished sacrifices by his one sacrifice of himself."

Next comes the eloquent Chrysostom. The metaphors and apostrophes of his highly tropical and vehement style, in the eyes of some of even the most renowned Romanists, mysteriously assume the figure, and vastness, and strength of mighty, impregnable bulwarks; from each of which Chrysostom, Goliath-like, appears to sally forth, shouting defiance to all who, from adherence to Scripture, have thence the imprudent hardihood to refuse assenting to the most

incredible—the most impious dogma ever propounded;—and arrayed in the airy armour of metaphors, becomes the invincible champion of a doctrine never heard of in the world till centuries after his death, and scatters dismay and destruction among all who will not renounce scripture and reason, and enlist in the confused, self-confounding, and conflicting ranks of the transubstantiators, and bow in base subjection to the unholy mandate of the ghostly despot of Rome. In such formidable guise did Chrysostom appear in the eyes of Bellarmine; who, accordingly, represents him so potent a champion for transubstantiation, as to be able to break through a whole host of adversaries.* Bellarmine's representation of Chrysostom is founded upon the following passage, in the 83 homily on Mat. "Although what Christ says may seem absurd to sense and reason, yet I beseech you, that in all things, especially in the mysteries, we regard not the things that lie before us, but observe the words of Christ, for the senses may be deceived, but we cannot be deceived by his words. Since, therefore, he said, This is my body, let us believe it wholly, for no insensible thing is given us by Christ but by sensible things; even as by the water in baptism, the gift of regeneration is understood to be bestowed. For if thou wert incorporeal, then only unbodily things should be given unto thee; but since thy soul is joined with a body, things intelligible are given by means of sensible things." Could the reading of this passage ever have suggested the idea of transubstantiation to any mind, unless that idea had previously existed in it? It is certain, at least, that such an idea never entered into the mind of Chrysostom. Our adversaries, I know, lay great stress upon the words "regard not the things that lie

* Bellar. de Euch. L. ii. c. 22.

before you, but observe the words of Christ, for the senses may be deceived, but we cannot be deceived by the words of Christ." The obvious meaning here is, fix not your attention on the sensible things before you—namely, the bread and wine—according to their common use, but fix your attention wholly on the spiritual and mystical use to which they have been set apart by consecration. Chrysostom puts no *substantive* difference between "all things" and "the mysteries;" the latter are merely to be regarded as more specially sacred.

What can be more repugnant to transubstantiation than this, that because man is constituted of body and soul, sensible and corporeal things must be ministered to the body in the sacrament, as signs or symbols of the spiritual things ministered to the soul in that holy ordinance. Again—he institutes a parallelism between the "sensible things" in the Eucharist, and the water in baptism. If the former be transubstantiated so must the latter, otherwise they are not parallel. But it has never been pretended that in baptism the substance of water is changed; neither then, according to Chrysostom, is there any change in the substance of bread and wine in the Eucharist. Chrysostom expressed his sentiments upon this subject very explicitly, in the epistle he addressed to Caesarius. Finding this epistle very decidedly adverse to transubstantiation, some Romanists have rejected it as spurious; whilst others, knowing that it could not be rejected, have ventured only to expurgate such sentences as were most hostile to their favourite doctrine. We subjoin the following translation of it by the learned Archbishop Wake.* "For, as before the bread is consecrated, we call

* Archb. Wake against Bossuet.—Larroque Hist. de l' Euch. Pt. i. c. 8.—Coventry's Strict. p. 141.

it bread; but when the grace of God, by the priest, hath consecrated it, it is no longer called bread, but is esteemed worthy to be called the Lord's body, although the *nature of bread* remain it." It is by this "bread that we are joined in communion."*

Cent. V.—In the conclusion of the last century, and in the beginning of this, flourished Augustine, an African bishop, the most renowned of all the ancient Fathers. His writings abound with proofs of the coincidence of his opinions on the Eucharist with those of Protestants. I shall mention only a few examples. Speaking as in the person of the Lord, he says, "You shall not eat of the body which you see, nor shall you drink of the blood which shall be shed by those who shall crucify me. I have commended to you a certain Sacrament, which being spiritually understood, shall quicken you."† Concerning the visible symbols, he says, "In Sacraments, we must regard not what they are, but what they exhibit, because the existent signs of things are different from the things signified."‡ These words are utterly irreconcileable with transubstantiation. If the signs by consecration become substantially the body of Christ, then the sign and the thing signified must be one and the same thing: but Augustine asserts that they are different. Yet still they have a likeness to each other.—"For, if the Sacraments had not some resemblance to the things whereof they are Sacraments, they could not be Sacraments. On account of this resemblance, they likewise, for the most part, take the names of the things themselves. Thus the Sacrament of the body of Christ is, in some manner, the body of Christ; and the Sacrament of his blood is,

---

* Nos per hunc panem unione conjungimur. Chrysost. in 1 Cor. Hom. 24.—† In Ps. 98.—‡ Cont. Max. L. iii. c. xxii.

in some manner, his blood ; and the Sacrament of faith is faith." " As for baptism itself, (he, the apostle, says,) we are buried together with Christ unto death by baptism—he does not say, we are understood, or are about, to be buried, but positively asserts, we are buried." Wherefore he concludes, that " to eat the flesh of Christ is a figurative speech." " In the banquet, Christ gave to his disciples the sign of his body, and when he gave them the sign, he did not hesitate to say, " This is my body."* Now, this sign was bread, for Augustine teaches, that " Judas did eat the bread of the Lord ;" but, in so doing, he did not eat the Lord's bread—*panem dominum.* For, he who does not dwell in Christ, without doubt, does not eat his spiritual flesh, nor drink his blood, though he carnally and visibly take the Sacrament between his teeth, and eat judgment to himself.†

Cyril, of Alexandria, became distinguished during the latter part of Augustine's life, and coincides in sentiment with that renowned prelate. He teaches, that " only the members of Christ eat the body of Christ—that they who receive the flesh of Christ are united to Him, so that Christ is found in them, and they in Christ."‡ But this union he holds to be effected, not in a *corporal manner*, but by faith ; for he declares, in his letter to the Nestorians, " that the body and blood of Christ, are received by *pure faith* alone." This doctrine was approved in the Council of Ephesus, and of Chalcedon, where six hundred of the Fathers were assembled.

The next author we may mention is Prosper, of Aquitain, a layman, who compiled a book of sentences from

---

* Augus. de Doct. Christ. L. iii. c. 16; Item. Cont. Ademant. Manich, c. 12. † In Joann Tract. 59; see more in Aubertin, L. ii. c. 2.—‡ Cyril Alex. in Joan. L. x. c. 13.

Augustine's works. He held the same opinions regarding the Eucharist as did that great African divine. He compares the "visible elements" to the human nature of Christ, and the "invisible flesh and blood" to his divine nature. But as the divine nature of Christ is purely and wholly spiritual, only spiritual nourishment can, therefore, be meant by "invisible flesh and blood."

Theodoret, who was ordained bishop of Antioch, A. D. 420, hath very clearly expressed his opinions regarding the Eucharist in a dialogue, in which the interlocutors are an orthodox divine, and a heretic who held that Christ's humanity, after his resurrection, lost its own nature, and was changed into his divinity. In debating this question, they advert to the Eucharist for illustration.

Orthodox.—Tell me; the mystical *signs* which are offered to God by God's priest, what say you are they the signs of?

Heretic.—Of the Lord's body.

It having been admitted by both parties that the signs (bread and wine) are meat and drink, the heretic then asks: But how do you call them after consecration?

Orthodox.—The body and blood of Christ.

Heretic.—And do you believe that you are a partaker of Christ's body and blood?

Orthodox.—I do believe so.

Heretic.—As the signs, then, of the Lord's body and blood are one thing before the priests' *prayer*, but after it are changed and become another,—so the Lord's body, after his ascension, is changed into a divine substance.

Orthodox.—You are taken now in a net of your own making. For the *mystical signs* do not, after sanctification, depart from their *own nature*. For they remain still

in their former substance, and figure, and form; and may be seen and touched as before.

Romanists have ever found it a perplexing task to explain away the meaning of Theodoret's clear and forcible words. Bellarmine attempts to remove the difficulty by an ingenious, though almost unintelligible, quibble—namely, that Theodoret speaks of the *substance of the accidents*. But Theodoret includes nature, substance, form, and figure, all in the same sentence. But it may be asked—if the signs retain their former nature and properties—why are they called the body of Christ? "Because (saith Theodoret) our Saviour indeed changed the names, and imposed that name on his body, which was the name of symbol and sign of his body." Again: "he honoured the symbols and signs which we see, with the name of his body and blood, —*not changing their nature, but adding grace to nature.*" It is then clear as day, that this Father maintained the orthodox opinion which Protestants receive regarding the Eucharist. A Roman edition of the dialogue, from which we have taken the foregoing extracts, was published in A.D. 1547, to which the Apostolic Chalcographer, Nicolinus Stephanus, prefixed an epistle, wherein he ingenuously confesses, that "Theodoret does not by any means think correctly concerning transubstantiation in these passages; that he is, however, to be excused, since the Romish Church had not then declared the law upon that point."*

Pope Gelasius, who was inducted into the bishopric of Rome in 492, coincides exactly in the opinion of Theodoret. Gelasius wrote against the Eutychians and Nestorians,

---

* In his locis de transubstantione minus commode sentire excusandum tamen, quoniam de ea Ecclesia Romana nondum legem tulisset.

and says: "Assuredly the sacraments, which we receive of the body and blood of Christ, are divine things, by which we are made partakers of the divine nature, yet they lose not the nature and substance of bread and wine; and, in truth, the image and *similitude* of the body and blood of Jesus Christ, is celebrated in the action of the mysteries." Again: "The symbols become divine by the operation of the Holy Spirit, but retain the property of their own nature." So decisive is the testimony of Gelasius, that Cardinal Contarini, in the conference of Ratisbon, A.D. 1541, admitted it to be unanswerable.*

In the Bibliotheca of Photius, we have several fragments belonging to Ephrem, Patriarch of Antioch. In explaining the hypostatic union, wherein there is no confusion of natures, but in which each retains the properties of its own nature, he refers for an illustration to the sacramental union, where spiritual benefits are combined with the consecrated bread and wine: "No man of a sound mind can say, that that which can be handled and that which can not be handled, that which is visible and that which is invisible, possess the same nature. Even as the body of Christ, which is received by the faithful, does not depart from its own *sensible substance*, but continues in union with intelligible grace: and baptism, also, though wholly spiritual, still preserves the property of its own sensible substance —namely, of water—which loses nothing by the change it has undergone."

Pope Leo I., who flourished about the middle of this century, has left his testimony in favour of spiritual nourishment: "In the mystical distribution of the spiritual

---

* Coventry's Strictures on the Mass.—Cosin's Hist. of Transubstantiation.

food that is given—that is, taken—to the end, that by receiving the *virtue* of this celestial meat, we might be turned into his flesh, which is made our flesh." Macarius the Egyptian, says, "there ought to be offered in the church bread and wine—the resemblances and representatives—exhibiting the body and blood of Christ. By this means, we eat spiritually of the blood of Christ."

Cent. VI.—In this century, learning greatly decreased in the west, owing to the ascendency the northern barbarians had then obtained over the fertile lands of the south. Superstitions and monastic institutions greatly increased.—Though monasteries became injurious to pure religion, yet it is unquestionably to them that we owe the preservation of the writings of the ancients. This century produced few theological works of merit. We have, however, several testimonies in favour of the orthodox opinion entertained by Protestants regarding the Eucharist.

Procopius of Gaza teaches, that "the Lord gave the image, figure, and type of his body,—admitting no longer the bloody sacrifices of the law."

About the middle of this century flourished Facundus, bishop of Hermiana, in Africa. We have the following famous passage in his works: "The Sacrament of adoption may be called adoption, like as the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ which is in the consecrated bread and cup, is called his body and blood; not because the bread is properly his body, and the cup his blood, but because they contain in them the mystery of his body and blood."*—Hence the Lord himself called the blessed bread and cup, his body and blood. Du Pin is candid enough to state this testimony fairly, and finding it irrefragable, leaves it,

* Facund. L. ix. c. 5.

without attempting to reconcile it to transubstantiation, simply referring his readers to the Controvertists.

Before adverting to Gregory I. bishop of Rome, who made very great changes upon the Romish Liturgy, insomuch that the formulary he prescribed for the celebration of the Eucharist was named the Gregorian Canon, we may present to the reader a few passages from the other ancient Liturgies. Those that bear the names of certain of the apostles, are well known to be erroneously attributed to them. As the authors, then, are not known, it would be presumptuous to pretend to determine the precise time at which they were written. St. James's Liturgy began to be cited after the fifth General Council, which was held at Constantinople, A.D. 553. In it, the bread and wine are called "the gifts ὦρα"—the sacramental use of them is called, "the sacrifice of the immaculate mysteries; a venerable and unbloody sacrifice." In consecration, the Priest prays, that God himself would bless this "shew bread προθεσιν ταυτην, and receive it unto his heavenly altar." This must be spiritually understood. When he distributes the Sacrament he calls it "bread αρτον;" and, according to our Lord's example, says, "Take, eat, it is my body, broken for you, and given for the remission of sins." [The People say] Amen.—[Then the Priest takes the cup and says] "In like manner, after he had supped, he took the cup, and the first fruits of the vine, and water; and looking unto heaven, and shewing them unto Thee, God and Father,—giving thanks, sanctifying, blessing, and filling with the Holy Spirit, he gave it to the holy and blessed disciples, saying, Drink ye all of it; this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for you, and for many, and is given for the remission of sins."—[People] Amen.—[Priest] "This do in *commemoration* of me; for as often as ye eat this

bread αρτον and drink this cup, ye do shew the death of the Son of Man, and confess his resurrection till he come."

According to St. Mark's Liturgy, consecration is performed by prayer. In distributing the Sacramental symbols, the Priest says, " This is my body, broken and distributed for the remission of sins; this is my blood of the New Testament, shed and distributed for the remission of sins. [People] Amen. [Priest] This do, εις την εμην αναμνησιν, in *remembrance* of me; for as often as ye eat this *bread*, and drink this cup, ye shew my death, and confess my resurrection and ascension, till I come."

In Basil's Liturgy, consecration is performed by prayer; and then the service goes on thus: " For, when he was about to go out to a voluntary, illustrious, and life-giving death; in the night in which he was delivered for the life of the world, taking bread, with his holy and unpolluted hands, and having presented it to Thee, both God and Father, he gave thanks, blessed, sanctified, brake it, [the Priest blessing after the same manner] and gave it to his holy disciples and apostles, saying, Take, eat, this is my body, broken for you, for the remission of sins. [People] Amen. [Priest] When, in like manner, he had taken the cup of the fruit of the vine, he mingled it, gave thanks, blessed and sanctified it, and gave it to his holy disciples and apostles, saying, Drink ye all of it; this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for you, and for many, for the remission of sins. [People] Amen. [Priest] This do in *commemoration* of me; for as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew forth my death, and confess my resurrection."

Besides these, there were Liturgies attributed to St. Peter, St. Matthew, St. Andrew, St. Clement; but we pass over these, and come to that ascribed to Chrysostom. This

Liturgy is unquestionably the production of a much later age than that of the eloquent eastern divine to whom it is attributed. Chrysostom is named in it among the dead. In some editions, Alexius, the Emperor, and Pope Nicholas, who lived in the ninth century, are named.* Lord Mornay asserts, that it must have been written not less than five hundred years after Chrysostom's death. In this Liturgy there is a very marked departure from the comparatively scriptural simplicity of style pervading these from which we have made extracts. Yet, even in this Liturgy, consecration is performed by the invocation of blessing. The Sacramental elements are thereafter called, δωρα, *in the plural*, gifts, which is irreconcileable with the supposition, that they have been transubstantiated into the true body of Jesus Christ. Of these gifts, or as they are afterwards called, the "holy bread αγιον αρτον," and "holy cup αγιον ποτηριον," the people are enjoined to partake, "*remembering* his salutary command, and all that he did for us—his cross, sepulchre, resurrection on the third day, his ascension into heaven, sitting on the right hand, and his second glorious coming." Such a memorial as this is truly a spiritual sacrifice. Transubstantiation and corporal sacrifice for the sins of the quick and the dead are utterly at variance with the Liturgy of Chrysostom, which is still the Service of the Greek church."†

About the end of this century, Gregory the Great established the canon of the Mass at Rome; but it differs in many things from that now received in the Romish Church. The dissimilarity will easily be discovered by comparing the Roman office of the eighth century, in the Bibliotheca

---

* Du Moulin's Mysteries of the Mass, p. 165.—† See the Travels of Hartley, the Missionary, in Greece.

Patrum, with the present Roman Missal; and by consulting Du Moulin's Mysteries of the Mass, b. 2. c. 9.*

It was long, however, before the Gregorian canon was generally received in Europe; for as yet, different church formularies were observed. Milan and France had adopted the Ambrosian Office; in Spain, the Service was performed variously; and England adhered to the pattern she had received, from those who had preached the gospel to her, soon after the days of the Apostles.† Paganism, however, was predominant wherever the Anglo-Saxons prevailed.—About A.D. 596, Gregory, bishop of Rome, sent a monk, named Augustine, to evangelise the Saxons. In passing through France, he was surprised to observe that her church service differed much from the Roman. In writing to Gregory, therefore, he inquired: "Wherefore is it, seeing there is one faith, that the customs of the churches are so different? And there is one custom of the masses in the Roman church, and another is observed by the Gauls?"—Gregory answers, "Your brotherhood knows what is the

---

* Their Missal (saith Gataker) is a mere patchery of old and new. From the fragments of antiquity that yet remain, this very doctrine of theirs may be very evidently confuted. For therein, after consecration, they pray unto God to accept that holy sacrifice which, of his gifts, they offer, and vouchsafe to look propitiously upon these his gifts, and accept them as he did Abel's offering, and Abraham's sacrifice: and that he will command them to be carried up by the hands of his angel; and this through Jesus, by whom he createth, quickeneth, and blesseth all these good things. They pray that the holy angel may be sent to carry these holy gifts up to heaven: though, withal, they say Christ's body never came thence, and never returneth. But Pope Innocent, as if repenting of the prayer he had just made, then entreats that it may stick fast in his guts. Corpus tuum, Domine, quod sumpsi et sanguis quam potavi adhereat vesceribus meis.—GATAKER'S DEFENCE, p. 206.

† Tertullian, who wrote about A.D. 206, saith: "The inaccessible places of the Britons are subject to the true Christ."—Lib. Cont. Judeos, c. 7.

custom of the Roman church in which you were brought up; but I do approve, that if you have found any thing that is good, either in the Roman, or in the Gallican, or in any other church, you do carefully choose what may be most pleasant and acceptable to Almighty God. For we must not love the things because of the place, but we must love the places because of the good things."

Augustine having arrived in England with his forty monks, was warmly seconded in his missionary labours by the zeal of Bertha, wife of Ethelbert, King of Kent; and succeeded in effecting the conversion of the Sovereign, with many of his subjects. The foundation of Romanism was laid at this time in England; and in the course of the next century, the whole country was induced to receive the Roman chant and Roman order. The nations, however, that were converted in the sixth century, embraced Christianity only in name; for they remained flagitious in their lives, and continued to observe the superstitious and idolatrous rites of their old institutions.*

Cent. VII.—In the beginning of this century, flourished Isodore, bishop of Seville, a man of great erudition. Du Pin relates, that Isodore called "the Sacrament a Sacrifice; because it is made sacred by mystical prayer, in remembrance of the passion of our Lord."† This is quite conformable to the Protestant opinion. Isodore's words are: "That the bread is the body of Christ; that the wine is the blood of Christ; that the bread, because it strengthens the body, is, therefore, called the body of Christ; and wine, because it maketh blood, is, therefore, called the blood of

---

* Mosheim, Cent. VI. part i. c. 1.—† Du Pin's Eccles. Auth. v. ii. p. 2.

Christ. Both these are visible things; but being sanctified by the Holy Spirit, are changed into the Sacrament of the divine body. For the bread which we break, is the body of Christ,—who says, I am the living bread: and the wine is his blood, according as it is written, I am the true vine."* The change here mentioned is, that from being common bread, it becomes, by mystical prayer, sacramental bread, or sacrament of the divine body. But there is no implied change of substance; for he states explicitly elsewhere, that "as the substance of the visible bread and wine nourishes the outward man, so the word of Christ, which is the living bread, being received by faith, refreshes the souls of believers."†

There is reason to believe that these sentiments of Isodore were then commonly received in Spain. He was president of the council held at Seville, in A.D. 619; ‡ he was also a member of the fourth council of Toledo, assembled by king Sisenand, in A.D. 633; which was composed of six archbishops, fifty-three bishops, and seven presbyters, bishops' deputies.§ This council drew up a Confession of Faith. It was also agreed, that as they had but one faith, they should adhere to one mode of discipline, and observe the same things in the celebration of divine service. This Liturgy probably was the same as the Ambrosian, which was received in France; for it was sometimes called the Gallican Office, and sometimes the Office of Toledo. The Spanish Christians continued to use this Liturgy till about A.D. 1090, when they were compelled to relinquish it for the Roman Mass.¶ It is, morever, or-

---

* Isod. de Offic. L. i. c. 18.—† Isod. de Etymol. L. vi. c. 19.—‡ Du Pin, v. ii. on the Councils, p. 3.—§ Ibid, pp. 4, 5, 6.—¶ Du Moulin's Myst. of the Mass, p. 187.

dained, in the third canon of this council, "that in case there be any matter of faith, or any affair concerning the good of the whole church, they shall call a general synod of the provinces of Spain and France."* This proves clearly that these countries owned no subjection to the bishop of Rome, at this period, in matters of faith; nay, it even affords a presumption that they followed a different ritual from that of Italy.

Cent. VIII.—The age in which Hesychius flourished has not been exactly determined, but from the authors whom he quotes, and again by whom he is quoted, it is certain, that he must have written either in this or in the preceding century. Concerning the Eucharist, he says, "If his body had not been crucified, we should not have eaten him; for the food we now eat is the *memorial* of his passion. We are not to conceive any thing earthly or carnally of the holy things, but are commanded to receive them divinely and *spiritually*."† From this author, we learn also that it was customary, in his time, "to burn what remained of the Sacrament with fire." The idea of the corporal presence had therefore no existence.

We now come to the testimony of the venerable Bede, one of the most learned and laborious writers of his age. Commenting upon Luke xxii. he says, "Instead of the flesh and blood of the Lamb, Christ substituted the Sacrament of his flesh and blood in the *figure* of bread and wine." Upon Psalm xxiii. "He gave to his disciples, in the Supper, the *figure* of his own holy body and blood."

During this century, the question of image worship was keenly discussed, and led to the rejection, by some, of the

---

* Du Pin's Eccles Auth. v. ii. on the Councils, p. 5.—† Hesych. on Levit. L. i. c. 2.

terms *types and antitypes*, which had hitherto been applied to the Sacrament. Those who opposed image worship argued, that the Sacramental symbols were the only images of Christ. In support of this opinion, they alleged the authority of Scripture, and the unanimous consent of the Fathers, by whom they were called *figures and antitypes*.—John Damascenus, the most eloquent of the advocates of image worship, maintained, contrary to all truth, that the Eucharistical bread and wine were not figures and antitypes, but the very body of Christ. "The bread and the wine are not the type or figure of the body and blood of Jesus, but the very deified body of our Lord; our Lord himself saying, This is, not the figure of my body, but my body: not the figure of my blood, but my blood."* But Damascenus did not imagine, as Romanists do, that the substance of bread was changed into Christ's body, while the accidents remain the same. For he held as an invariable truth, "that accidents do not exist by themselves, but that they have their existence in some subject: thus the soul is a substance, and prudence an accident,—take away the soul, and prudence perishes."† He, indeed, taught that the substance of bread remains, and that it nourishes, our bodies being changed into their substance. He likewise compares the change in the bread and wine, consequent upon consecration, to what happens to the water in baptism: "To the water God hath joined the grace of the Holy Spirit, that it becomes the washing of regeneration; and, in like manner, God hath joined his divinity to the Sacramental bread and wine, which thereby become his body and blood."‡ He illustrates this change by another comparison: "Isaiah saw a coal; but as the coal is not simple fuel, but is united to fire; so the

---

* Larroque Hist. de L'Euch. Part ii. c. 11.—† Ibid.—‡ Ibid.

communion bread is not simple bread, but is united to the divinity."* Luther used a similar comparison, for illustrating the doctrine of consubstantiation, namely, that hot iron is united with fire.

The Emperor Constantine assembled a Council at Constantinople in A.D. 754, which was composed of three hundred and thirty-eight bishops, and lasted six months.—In this Council, image worship was condemned, and the arguments refuted by which it had been supported. In doing this, the Fathers were led to record their sentiments upon the Eucharist: "Let those rejoice who, with very pure souls, make the *image* (Eucharist) of Jesus Christ; who desire it, reverence it, and offer it for the salvation of the soul and the body, the which gave to his disciples, in *figure* and *commemoration*."† "He hath chosen no other likeness nor other type under heaven, to represent his incarnation, than this image of his vivifying body, he hath commanded us to offer, as for his image, a chosen matter, that is to say, the *substance* of bread having neither human form nor figure, that idolatry might not been introduced;" and lastly, "by the interposition of the Priest, the bread is, from common, rendered into holy;" and "this is his body by institution, that is to say, his holy image." That we may duly appreciate this testimony, it was given incidentally and undesignedly, for the point in dispute was the worship of images: and it is the testimony of the whole eastern church, represented in Council. The decrees of this Council remained in force throughout the Oriental Church for thirty-two years. They were set aside by the idolatrous Empress Irene, and the packed Council of Nice, A.D. 787, in so far as they condemned image worship, which was now declared

---

* Larroque Hist. de L'Euch. Part ii. c. 12.—† Ibid.

to be more efficacious than prayer; and it was likewise denied, that the Eucharistieal bread and wine were images, or antitypes of Christ's body and blood; but they did not deny that the bread remained the same in substance—which they would have done had they been able—seeing that they manifested, even to a degree of ridiculous extravagance, their inclination to contradict the Constantinopolitan Fathers.

The acts of this Council being brought to Rome,* extracts of them were sent to France, where they excited much dissatisfaction. Charlemagne submitted them for examination to the most eminent divines of the kingdom, amongst whom our renowned countryman, Alcuin, held the most distinguished place. A treatise was consequently drawn up, reprobating in strong terms the worship of images, but at the same time permitting them to he hung in churches. —Charlemagne opposed many of the growing superstitions of the age with vigour; but his attachment to the Roman Pontiff, with some other circumstances, rendered his efforts abortive.† Through his influence, the Gregorian Canon succeeded in displacing the Ambrosian Liturgy in most of the churches in France. At the solicitation of the Pontiff, Adrian, he laboured strenuously to mould all the Latin churches according to the model of Rome. Several of them, however, openly and boldly resisted the imperial and pontifical efforts. Neither won by persuasion, nor over-awed by violence, the churches of Milan and Corbetta, in particular, continued steadfastly to adhere to the Ambrosian Liturgy. In what respects this differed from the Roman Office it is now impossible to say, seeing neither the one nor the other have come to us pure, entire, or unaltered.

---

* Du Pin's Eccles. Auth., 8th cent.—† Mosheim, 8th cent.

That the Liturgy of Ambrose was adverse to the doctrine of transubstantiation, is indubitable from the evidence formerly adduced of his sentiments; but we know besides, that it contained the following petition, offered by the priest:— "Grant that this oblation may be imputed unto us as acceptable and reasonable, which is the FIGURE of the body and blood of Jesus Christ our Lord."* The Canon of the Mass was at that time equally repugnant to transubstantiation, if it was in accordance with the sentiments of Charlemagne, its great patron in the western empire, who wrote to Alcuin in these terms: "Christ supping with his disciples, brake bread; and likewise gave the cup to them, in FIGURE of his body and blood."†

Cent. IX.—In this century the dogma of the corporal presence in the Eucharist was first propounded. John Damascenus, the image worshipper, had already given currency to some innovations, in the language used respecting the Sacrament, namely, the denying the bread and wine to be *figures* and *antitypes*. But now a great innovation of doctrine concerning the Eucharist took place; for the dogma of Christ's corporal presence began to be taught by Paschasius Radbertus. Bellarmine and Sirmondus confess that this monk was the first who wrote clearly concerning the body and blood of Christ in the Sacrament. The writings of Radbertus, no doubt, tended considerably to prepare the way for the doctrine of transubstantiation; yet it certainly was not clearly taught by him, nor for ages after. "His doctrine (says Mosheim) amounted in general to the two following propositions: First, That after the consecration of the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper,

---

* Du Moulin's Mysteries of the Mass, b. ii. cc. 7, 8; Ibid. c. 9.

nothing remained of these symbols but the *outward figure*, under which the body and blood of Christ are really and locally present; and, Secondly, That the body of Christ, thus present in the Eucharist, was born of the Virgin, suffered upon the cross, and was raised from the dead."* I add, that he likewise maintained, that the blood received in the Sacrament, is the very same that came out of our Lord's side upon the cross.

There are, nevertheless, many expressions in his book "On the Body and Blood of Christ," manifesting something like the ancient doctrine of the spiritual presence only.—Such are the following: "Christ left to us in this Sacrament, a visible figure and character of his flesh and blood, that by these things, our minds apprehending invisible and spiritual things, may be the more richly nourished.—Spiritual Sacraments must be perceived with the palate of the mind and the taste of faith.—While we taste in it nothing carnal but spiritual, and understand it wholly spiritual, we abide in Christ.—The flesh and blood of Christ are spiritually received." We might easily add many other similar phrases, but they would not be a sufficient antidote to the pernicious doctrine of his book. This book was written in A.D. 831, and designed for the instruction of the monks of Corby.—Some of them contemned its doctrine, as it was unquestionably new and repugnant to the sentiments then generally entertained, which, as appears from the works of contemporary writers, were in conformity with ancient doctrine.

Amularius, bishop of Triers, says, in his preface to his work upon Ecclesiastical Offices, "The bread, and the wine, and the water, are the Sacrament of the flesh and

---

* Mosheim, Cent. IX. part ii. c. 3, s. 19.

blood of Christ. The Sacrament of the body of Christ is in some manner the body of Christ. For if the sacraments had not some resemblance to the things of which they are the sacraments, they could not possibly be sacraments; but from this resemblance they, for the most part, take the names of the things themselves." Wherefore, it is remarked in another place, "that the sacraments are profitable in this, that they lead us to the very things of which they are sacraments."*

Rabanus Maurus, the celebrated disciple of the great Alcuin, and archbishop of Mayence, having heard of the novel and pernicious doctrine of Radbert, undertook the refutation of it, as he himself informs in his Penitential.— "Some persons, of late, entertaining pernicious sentiments respecting the body and blood of our Lord, have said, that it is the very body and blood of Christ, which was born of the virgin Mary, and in which our Lord suffered upon the cross, and rose again from the grave, which error we have contradicted as much as we could, and have shewn in writing to the Abbé Egilo, what ought to be believed respecting the body." Here then is his doctrine: "The Lord designed that the Sacraments of his body and blood should be received by the mouths of the faithful, and become food to them, that by a visible body an invisible effect might be manifested. For, as material food nourishes and invigorates the body, so the Word of God inwardly nourishes and strengthens the soul. It pleased him that these Sacraments should be made of the fruits of the earth, that as the invisible God himself appeared a mortal man, he, in like manner, by a visible matter, aptly made known to them an invi-

* Amular. de Eccles. Offic. L. i. c. 24.

sible thing. By this, the Sacrament of the Lord's Table is received by some to life, by others to destruction; but the thing itself is life to every man who shall partake of it, and death to none,—that is, he shall be joined a member to Christ, the head of the heavenly kingdom, because the Sacrament is one thing, and the *virtue* of the Sacrament another. With the mouth the Sacrament is received; with the virtue of the Sacrament the inward man is satisfied; and as the Sacrament is changed into our bodies, when we eat and drink of it, so are we changed into the body of Christ, when we live obediently and piously. Believers, therefore, truly eat Christ's body, if they do rightly discern his body;—they become the body of Christ, if they desire to live by the Spirit of Christ."*—This archbishop was, therefore, a teacher of Protestant doctrines,—so were the great majority of his contemporaries; but, instead of citing the testimonies of Walfridius Strabo Haymo, bishop of Halberstadt, and others, it may be more to the purpose to state, that the doctrine of Paschasius having given great and general offence, the Emperor, Charles the Bald, desired Bertram, Presbyter of Corby, and Scot Irigena, the most illustrious literary men of the age, to explain to him the true doctrine of the Eucharist. The two questions the Emperor put to Bertram were: "Whether the faithful receive with the mouth the body of Jesus Christ in a mystery or in reality, that is, whether Christ's body be discerned by faith or by sense; and, if by sense, whether it be the body of Jesus Christ, which was born of the virgin, suffered, died, and was buried, and is now at the right hand of God?" Bertram replies, that "if the mystery is not per-

* Larroque Hist. de L'Euch. p. 587, and Cosin's Hist. Transub. cent. ix.

formed under a *figure*, it cannot properly be called a mystery, since there could be nothing hid, nothing removed from sense, nothing covered under some veil." Then he states, "that the bread and wine, by consecration, become the body and blood of Jesus Christ, and are so called. But as to the SUBSTANCES of these creatures, they are the same after consecration as before. For, that they possess their former properties is what no one can deny, wherefore, it is clear, that the bread and wine are figuratively the body and blood of Jesus Christ. If, as some maintain, nothing is here received figuratively, but must be understood literally; then faith performs nothing, since nothing spiritual is wrought, and all is to be corporally understood. And since faith, according to the Apostle, is the evidence of things not seen, that is to say, the substance of things which do not appear, and not of these things which do appear,—for then we would receive nothing by faith, seeing we might judge of what existed by the bodily senses,—can any thing be more absurd than to take bread for flesh, and to say, wine is blood? The bread and the wine are not corporally but spiritually changed: this change is, therefore necessarily *figurative;* for it is true that the spiritual body of Jesus Christ is under the form of material bread and wine." These doctrinal statements are illustrated at considerable length, and are confirmed by arguments from the Scriptures, reason, and the testimonies of the Fathers.*

---

* Bertram's book was first printed by Protestants, and was decried by Romanists as a gross forgery. But as the authenticity was soon established beyond contestation, the only resource they had was to cut the obnoxious passages out of the book; but Daillé has collected these in his book "On the Use of the Fathers." The edition before me was printed at Rouen, A.D. 1672, in Latin and French. An English translation, with a learned dissertation prefixed, was published at Dublin, 1752. From a hatred to his book, some Romanists have spoken

Scotus's book, which he wrote in reply to the Emperor's request, has been less fortunate than Bertram's; for it was burned two hundred years after it had been written by the Council of Verceil, A.D. 1050,* because he was the adversary of Radbert, whose doctrine had now obtained numerous advocates. Hincmarus,† who appears to have inclined rather to the doctrine of Radbert, remarks, that Prudentius, bishop of Troyes, and John Scotus, held, that "the sacraments of the altar are not the true body and the true blood of our Lord, but only the *memorial* of his true body and blood." Heribold,‡ the arch-chaplain to Charles the Bald, was of Scotus's sentiment. In brief, history records the names of sixteen of the most illustrious men of the age, in England, Germany, and France, as adversaries of Radbert's doctrine, whilst it was adopted by only one, or at most by two. This, then, was a controversy of vast importance, occupying the attention of kings, and engaging the pens of presbyters, bishops, and archbishops. But what had become of that all-important personage—the supreme judge of controversy—the Pope? Why did not he decide the contest by his sapient decree? Why are both Nicholas I. and Adrian II. silent? Did they hold Radbert's doctrine as the Romish Church now does? Then why did they negligently permit the greatest Church dignitaries to teach and defend the opposite, without the smallest animadversion, to the great detriment of religion? Did they, on the contrary, coincide in the opinion of these influential men—then it is easy to account for their silence.

---

contemptuously of Bertram's reputation; but so high was it in his own age, that the French bishops selected him as their defender of the Latin Church against the Greeks.

* Larroque, Hist. de L'Euch. p. 619.—† Id. p. 580.—‡ Larroque, Hist de Euch. part ii. c. 14.

Seeing an irrational and absurd dogma, started by a fanatic monk, (for Radbert pretended miracles in proof of his opinion, plainly manifesting his mistrust of being able to prove it by Scripture or by the Fathers,) of small credit, and with almost no followers; and seeing it ably refuted by learned churchmen, their Holinesses prudently abstained from coming forward to settle a question by their authority, which appeared more satisfactory settled without it.

There were various superstitious customs prevalent in this century which completely disprove the belief of the corporal presence. Michael,* surnamed Balbus, Emperor of the East, issued an edict, A. D. 820, prohibiting the mingling the colours of those who professed the monastic life with the Eucharistical elements, and then administering them to the communicants.

It had also been the custom for a long time to mix ink with the consecrated wine, to sign writings of a peculiarly solemn nature. It was with this mixture that Pope Theodore, in the seventh century, signed the condemnation and deposition of Pyrrhus the Monothelite. Charles the Bald, and Bernard, Count of Barcelona, signed a treaty with it in A. D. 844; and the condemnation of Photius, by the Fathers of the Council of Constantinople, was signed with it in A.D. 869.

Cent. X.—In this century the gloom of superstition and ignorance gathers thicker and darker around; still, however, there are some faint gleams of light which shew the doctrine taught in this age, viz. that the consecrated elements of the Eucharist were the body and blood of Christ—not materially and corporally, but figuratively and by spiritual

---

* Du Pin's Eccles. Auth. v. ii. cent. ix.

mystery. John Scotus Erigena, whom we mentioned above as having, at the desire of Charles the Bald, refuted the errors of Radbert, was invited into England by King Alfred. Here he employed himself in instructing young men in the monastery of Malmesbury; and it may naturally be expected that he continued to teach the saeramental doctrine he had formerly defended. Towards the end of this century, Aelfrick, the abbot of the same monastery, was elevated to the Archbishopric of Canterbury. He wrote a Saxon Homily, which continued long to be read in the English churches as the Easter homily. He held, as Du Pin acknowledges, and as the following extracts prove, the same opinions concerning the Eucharist as Bertram and Scotus: "The bread and wine which is sanctified by the priest's ministry, shew one thing outwardly to men's senses, and inwardly they call up another thing to believing minds. Outwardly, they are seen to be bread and wine, both in figure and taste; and after consecration, they are truly Christ's body and blood, by spiritual mystery. In like manner, the holy font water, which is called the well-spring of life, appears to the senses like other water, and is subject to corruption; but the power of the Holy Ghost cometh to the corruptible water by the priest's blessing, that, by its spiritual virtue, it may wash the body and soul from all sin. Behold now we see two things in this one creature: in its true nature, that water is corruptible moisture; but as a spiritual mystery, it hath healing virtue. So, also, if we behold that holy housel (host) after bodily sense, we see that it is a creature corruptible and mutable. If we acknowledge the spiritual virtue therein, then do we understand that therein is life, and that it giveth life to those who eat it in faith. There is much difference between the body of Christ that suffered and the body which was hal-

lowed to be a housel. Truly the body in which Christ suffered was born of the flesh of Mary, with blood and bone, skin and sinews, human limbs, and with a reasonable soul; and his spiritual body, which we call the housel, is composed of many grains, without blood, bone, limb, and soul: so that nothing therein is to be understood corporally, but spiritually. That in the housel giving the substance of life, is spiritual virtue and invisible efficacy.—Certainly Christ's body, that suffered death and rose again from the dead, shall never more die, but is eternal and impassible. That housel is temporal, not eternal,—corruptible and distributable,—is chewed with the teeth, and transmitted into the belly. This mystery is a pledge and *figure:* Christ's body is the truth itself. We keep this pledge mystically until we come to the truth itself, and then the pledge will be ended." There are other two discourses of this author extant. One addressed to Wulfstane, Archbishop of York, in which it is said, "That the Lord hallowed the bread and wine into his own body and blood before his suffering; and that, by the hands of the priest, he daily halloweth bread and wine into his own body and blood,—not bodily, but in spiritual mystery." The other is addressed to Wulfinus, Bishop of Sherbourne, expressing the same sentiments, namely, that "the host is Christ's body, not corporally but spiritually;—not the body in which he suffered, but that of which he spake when he hallowed bread and wine into a host." Such was the doctrine delivered to the clergy of England at the end of the tenth century, and which continued to be read afterwards in the churches; so that it may fairly be considered to have been the faith of England.*

* Usher's Answer to a Jesuit, p. 77—80.—Preservative against Popery, Title ix. p. 162.

If we pass over to the Continent, we find Folcuin, abbot of the monastery de Lobes, saying, in reference to the Sacramental Table, "that it is the table on which the sacred body of the Lord is consumed."* No Romanist—nay, no man—will ever admit such language to be applicable to Christ's natural body. This abbot died A.D. 990, and was succeeded in his office by Herigerus, who "made a collection of passages from the Catholic Fathers, in opposition to Radbert's doctrine."†

In the latter part of this century, Ratherius, bishop of Verona, writes: "As to the corporal substance the communicant receives, since it is I who at present put the question, it also necessarily falls on me to answer it, yet I sink under it; for, since it is true flesh to him who communicates worthily, though we see it to be the bread it was before; and likewise true blood, though we see it to be the wine it was before; I confess I know not what to say nor to think it is to him who partakes unworthily, that is to say, who dwells not in God." Had the doctrine of the conversion of the substance of bread into Christ's body, been held by this Italian bishop, he could have been at no loss to have answered the question; for, by that doctrine, his body must necessarily be received by both the righteous and the wicked.

Atto, bishop of Verceil, made use of expressions, which seem to indicate that he did not entertain the notion of the corporal presence. "What accursed presumption (he asks, in writing to one of his clergy, recommending personal purity,) is this, that he who knows that he is wallowing in all manner of uncleanness, should undertake to make, or to give to others the *Sacrament* of the body and blood of the Lord Jesus Christ." Sacrament always signified sacred

---

* Larroque, part ii. c. 16.—† Ibid.

sign ; in giving it, therefore, to communicants, the priests did not give them the material body and blood of the Lord.

Cent. XI.—The time advances, and ignorance, superstition, and error, progress with like rapidity. However, some rays of light still shoot athwart the gloom, and truth has still some distinguished defenders ; while some bear merely an incidental testimony, and some are its silent receivers. The monk, Bosco, who, at the beginning of this century, wrote the life of St. Genulph, relates of him, " that after the day of his ordination, he passed the remainder of his life without tasting wine, except in the celebration of the divine Sacrament." It is certain, therefore, that this writer did not believe the sacramental wine to be changed into blood. Leutheric, archbishop of Sens, is accused by the chronicler, Clarius, of not having adhered to Radbert's doctrine ; and elsewhere, he is reputed to be the first propagator of the opinions afterwards maintained by the famous Berenger.

The preceptor of Berenger was Fulbert, bishop of Chartres. " The mystery of faith in the Eucharist (saith this prelate) must be discerned, not by bodily sight, but by the spirit of the mind. For, the substance of bread and wine which outwardly appears, is now become inwardly the body and blood of Christ, not because it is discerned by the mouth, but because it is tasted by inward affection. Put forth, therefore, the palate, upon the jaws of hope, extend the bowels of love, and take the bread of life, the food of the inner man. From the faith of the inner man proceeds the taste of the divine savour, whilst assuredly, by the infusion of the salutary Eucharist, Christ glides into the bowels of the receiving soul." Such language is manifestly applicable, not to corporal, but only to spiritual manducation.

Fulbert's disciple, however, was the most illustrious

opponent of the Paschasian doctrine of this age. Berenger, perceiving that the gross corporal opinions first broached in the ninth century were spreading greatly, publicly maintained, 1045, that the bread and wine preserved their essential and natural qualities, and were the commemorative symbols and figures of the body and blood of the Lord. He was soon attacked by several French and German divines. Pope Leo IX. assembled a Council at Rome, in the year 1050, and condemned him without having even cited him to appear. In the same year another Council assembled at Vercelli, where Berenger was called to compear; who, however, contented himself with appointing two ecclesiastics to appear for him, and was again condemned. The book which John Erigena, or the Irishman, addressed to Charles the Bald, was by the same Council consigned to the flames; but Berenger disregarded the anathemas of both Councils, and maintained his cause with superior ability. —Many now engaged in the controversy, and spoke and wrote both for and against him. After four years' comparative quietness, his enemies prevailed upon Pope Victor II. to have the question decided against him anew. Accordingly, a Council was assembled at Tours, where Hildebrand, afterwards Gregory VII. presided, being the Pope's legate. Berenger was present, but being overpowered by his enemies, was induced to recant. However, resuming courage, he began again to disseminate the opinions he had before professed. Exasperated at this conduct, Pope Nicholas II. summoned him to a Council at Rome, and there so terrified him with threats, that he consented to sign any confession the Council might agree on. Cardinal Humbert, by the appointment of the assembly, drew up the following declaration of faith: "That the bread and wine which are placed upon the altar, are, after consecration, not

not only the sacrament, symbol, or figure, but are even the true body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ; and are not only sensibly in the sacrament, but are truly handled by the hands of the priest, and broken and grinded by the teeth." Through intimidation, Berenger affixed his signature to this as his creed; but ashamed at having professed so monstrous and blasphemous a belief, he no sooner returned to France than he proclaimed his utmost detestation of it, and declared that it was extorted from him by the Church of the Malignant and Council of Vanity. The dissimulation practised by Berenger was most reprehensible; yet it is to be remembered, that it was through terror of his life, as is manifest from his own account, as well as from the reproach cast upon him by his great rival and adversary Lanfranc: "You confessed the Catholic faith in presence of the whole council, not from love of the truth, but *through fear of death.*"

The succeeding Pontiff, Alexander II. tried the soft means of friendly expostulation, to induce him to renounce his original opinions once more, but in vain. When Gregory VII. was placed in the papal chair, with the view of terminating the controversy, he sent to bring Berenger to Rome, gave him permission to renounce the above profession, which Nicholas II. had extorted from him, and to draw up an ambiguous one of his own, with which the Pope was satisfied. Here, then, is one supreme and infallible judge of controversy, deciding the same question differently from a former supreme and infallible judge of controversy! But a number of Berenger's enemies, conceiving that he had made his confession in too vague terms, demanded a more explicit declaration; Gregory yielded, and he, therefore, was constrained to make a third confession, at a Council, held at Rome 1079, in which it is declared, that

" the bread and wine were, by the mysterious influence of holy prayer, and the words of our Redeemer, substantially changed into the true, proper, vivifying body of Jesus."— Berenger now returned home loaded with honours and recommendations; and, after having publicly retracted, he again employed his pen in an elaborate refutation of the belief he had engaged to profess. He was assailed anew with the invectives of adversaries, but the Papal thunders were still. Gregory, when he presided as Pope's legate at the Council of Tours, had strongly opposed Berenger's sentiments; but seems to have yielded afterwards to the weight of his arguments. For Cardinal Benno,* in his life of this Pontiff informs us, that Gregory, " wavering in the faith, enjoined his cardinals to keep a fast, that God might make known whether the Roman Church or Berenger held the more correct sentiments in regard to the body of the Lord."— While he imposed this obligation upon his ecclesiastical counsellors, he himself had recourse to the Virgin Mary, as appears from the letter he addressed to Berenger, before assembling the last Council, in A. D. 1079: "I do not doubt that you think correctly, according to the Scriptures, concerning the sacrifice of Christ. I must, however, have recourse to the blessed Virgin, as is my custom in matters that trouble me." Thereafter, the Virgin's answer is related: " The blessed Mary heard me, and instructed me that nothing is to be thought, nothing believed, concerning the sacrifice of Christ, but what the authentic Scriptures teach, against which Berenger has in no respect erred."— Writing to Almannus, Berenger says, " It is manifest that the true body of Christ is presented upon the table itself;

* Larroque, Hist. de L'Euch. p. 691.

but that is to say, the real body is spiritually presented to the inner man, to be eaten spiritually, uncorrupted, uncontaminated, unbroken, by those only who are the members of Christ." By these words it is demonstrated that Berenger's sentiments on the Eucharist accord exactly with those afterwards entertained by Calvin. As Pope Gregory VII. therefore agreed with Berenger in this article, and was instructed to do so by the blessed Virgin, we must conclude, that this Pope and the Virgin were sound Calvinists in this matter.

Gregory VII. laboured assiduously for the establishment of the Roman Office in all the western churches. The Spaniards had hitherto distinguished themselves by their ardent attachment to the Mozarabic or Gallican Liturgy, which had been approved by the Fathers in the Council of Toledo. The crafty Gregory prevailed upon the King to assist him in that undertaking, but the States of the land were decidedly opposed to the project. It was then agreed that the disputes between the King and the States should be determined thus: A knight was to be chosen on each side, and the party whose combatant was vanquished was to accept the liturgy of the victor. The King's champion fell, and the Roman Office was rejected. Some time after the King proposed a new trial by fire. Both liturgies were committed to the flames: the Roman perished, but the Mozarabic, as the story goes, sustained no injury. Though the Roman Office was thus doubly defeated, nevertheless the King laboured more zealously than ever for its introduction into Spain;—and by confiscations and bloody edicts, at length accomplished his object, about A. D. 1090. The six churches of Toledo, however, were allowed to retain their ancient *Service*.*

* Du Moulin's Mysteries of the Mass, p. 187.—Cassander's Liturgica.

Cent. XII.—We have seen, that the adherents of Berenger, and the advocates of Radbert's doctrine, were the two great contending parties in the preceding century, and that the latter succeeded in procuring the condemnation of the former in several Councils. It is confessed, however, by the victorious party, that the condemned doctrines were spread throughout England, France, and Italy, and did not become extinct with the life of their defender. They were, therefore, condemned again, several years after his death, by Urban II. in the Council of Plaisance, in A.D. 1095.—In the commencement of this century, Bruno, archbishop of Treves, expelled from his diocese those who professed the doctrines Berenger had ably defended, and who would not renounce the ancient faith, in conformity to the decrees of the Councils that tyranically oppressed him. Many of them, therefore, separated themselves openly from the communion of the Roman Church, and are mentioned in history under various names, derived from their principal ministers, or from their chief places of abode. They were called Albigenses, from Albigensium, an ancient name for several departments in the south of France, and Waldenses, Valdenses, or Vaudois, from the valleys of Piedmont, the inhabitants of which had long maintained the true faith.—About the year 1110, Peter de Bruys commenced his ministry in Provence and Languedoc, and laboured zealously and successfully for twenty years, in the reformation of ecclesiastical abuses and errors. His career was crowned with martyrdom in A.D. 1130. Those who professed the doctrines he taught were called Petrobrussians. Displeased at the prevalence of Berenger's sentiments in the south of France, Pope Calistus II. assembled a Council at Toulouse in 1119, and it was enacted that all should be driven from the bosom of the Church, who found fault with her

doctrine concerning the Sacrament of the Lord's body and blood. In the year following, the Albigenses published in the vulgar tongue, the reasons of their separation from the Romish Church; and gave this declaration of their belief concerning the Eucharist: "The manducation of the sacramental bread is the manducation of the body of Jesus Christ in a *figure;* Jesus Christ having said, as often as ye do this, do it in remembrance of me."* Peter de Bruys taught the same doctrine. After his death it was maintained by his successor, Henry, who preached at Mans with great zeal and vehemence against the superstitious ceremonies of the Church, the mass, and prayers for the dead.—He therefore became obnoxious to the clergy, and was forced to leave the town. He went to Poictiers and Bourdeaux, and the adjacent countries, diffusing his opinions with great success, his zeal and eloquence obtaining the utmost applause from the multitudes that gathered around him.—Speaking of his followers at Perigueux, a contemporary monk hath stated: "This sect is mightily increased, and not only a great many persons of quality leave their estates to be of their number, but likewise a great many ecclesiastics, and a great many religious of both sexes, follow them."† Henry at length arrived at Toulouse, in the year 1147, where his assiduous labours procured him great popularity. The renowned Bernard was sent to oppose him, and, by his eloquence and influence, so overpowered him, that he was obliged to seek safety in flight. He was, however, taken, and condemned by Pope Eugenius III. in the Council of Rheims, and soon after ended his days in prison. But though Bernard put Henry to flight,

---

* Larroque Hist. de L'Euch. part ii. c. 18; Du Pin, vol. ii. p. 318.—† Du Pin's Hist. of Ecclesiastical Authors, vol. ii. p. 318.

yet he could not extirpate his doctrines. "For (say the historians,) neither the punishment of Peter de Bruys, nor the preaching of St. Bernard, could arrest the progress of this sect, &c. Toulouse, Albi, Carcassonne, Beziers, Agde, Castres, Lavaur, and almost all the cities and country towns joined it."*

Whilst these things were going on in France, Arnold of Brescia, a man of erudition and remarkable intrepidity and austerity, inveighed with so much intemperance against the superstitious ceremonies, erroneous doctrines, and corrupt lives of the monks, clergy, and pontiffs, that the people became so inflamed against their ghostly rulers, as to set their laws and authority at defiance. After various changes of fortune, Arnold at last fell under the power of his enemies; was crucified at Rome in the year 1155; his body was burned, and his ashes thrown into the Tiber, lest his relics should have been venerated by the people.

We have mentioned these three unfortunate men, not as models, in all respects, to be followed in the reformation of a church, but simply as men bearing strong testimony against the Mass, and various other errors of the Roman church; and as leaders who were followed by great multitudes.

About this period, a sect, named Cathari, prevailed greatly, in Italy and the neighbouring countries. "They (says the monk Egbert) are increased to great numbers throughout all countries; their words eat like canker; they are armed with all those passages of Scripture that in any degree seem to favour their views: with these they know how to defend themselves and to oppose Catholic truth,

---

* Larroque, p. 715.

though they mistake entirely the true sense of Scripture, which cannot be discovered without great judgment." The historian Milner,* regards this people as descendants from the disciples of Claudius, bishop of Turin. Du Pin relates, that they denied "that the visible substance of bread and wine is changed into the body and blood of Jesus Christ."†

But of all the sects that prevailed in this century, the Vandois or Waldenses were the most numerous and the most celebrated. About the year 1160, Peter of Lyons, surnamed Valdus, or Waldus, an opulent merchant, being very zealous for the promotion of Christian knowledge and piety, employed a priest to translate a portion of the Scriptures into the vulgar tongue. Convinced of the vast difference of the Christianity taught in the Roman church and that taught in the Bible, and animated with an ardent zeal for the spiritual welfare of men, he distributed his goods among the poor, then assumed the office of their religious instructor, and has by many been reckoned the founder of the Waldenses. Whereas, Peter of Lyons obtained the surname of Valdus, or Waldus, from his having adopted the doctrines of the Vaudois, the inhabitants of the Piedmontese valleys—Vaux, in their language, signifying valley. —Amongst them the gospel had subsisted in primitive simplicity long before Peter became its distinguished propagator in France. For Renerius Sacco, the bloody inquisitor, who exerted himself for the extirpation of the Vaudois in the thirteenth century, asserts that this sect had existed upwards of five hundred years; and even refers to authors who maintain that the inhabitants of these Alpine valleys had continued in the same from the apostolic age.‡

---

* Milner, vol. iii. p. 384.—† Du Pin's Eccles. Authors, vol. ii. p. 319.—‡ Mosheim, 12th cent. part ii. c. 5.

Bossuet labours strenuously to prove that the Vaudois conformed to the Roman Church, and received most of her doctrines and sacraments. It is certain, however, that they denied purgatory, the Pope's supremacy,—received only two Sacraments, Baptism and the Lord's Supper,—and affirmed that Masses were damnable, especially those that are repeated for the dead.* Bossuet is chiefly anxious to prove them favourable to transubstantiation.† The evidence he adduces, is that of a man who confessed, in the court of the Inquisition in the year 1495, that the Barb, or Minister, by consecrating bread and wine, changes it into the body and blood of Christ. Yet might not the fear of the torture tend to elicit an answer known to be agreeable to the inquisitors? But what Bossuet terms his demonstration, that the Vaudois believed the corporal presence, is, that no accusation was made against them in this respect. Both Du Pin and Larroque, however, name several authors, who do accuse them of rejecting it.‡ "Like successors of Judas, (says Ebrand) they deny that to be the body of Christ, which he called his body." Cousord charges them with saying, "that the body and blood of Jesus Christ is not the true Sacrament, but blessed bread, which is called the body of Christ by a certain *figure*—like as it was said the rock was Christ." They were blamed with mocking the priests in styling them "god-makers." Renerius also accuses them of teaching, "that the body of Jesus Christ is simple bread, and that the only true body is his natural body." Many similar authorities might be mentioned, but these are sufficient to evince the futility of Bossuet's grand demonstration.

---

* Milner, vol. iii. p. 460.—† Hist. des Var. des Eglises, Protes. L. xi.—‡ Du Pin, vol. ii. p. 363; Larroque, p. 720.

It is a well authenticated fact, that the Albigenses and Vaudois differed in name rather than in doctrine. It is manifest, from their respective confessions of faith, that they entirely agreed upon the point under discussion. The Albigenses said, "the manducation of the sacramental bread is the manducation of Christ's body in a *figure*." The Waldensian doctrine was identically the same: "To eat the sacramental bread, is to eat the body of Christ in a figure."*

Though the word Transubstantiation was used, for the first time, in this century, yet even the most illustrious of those who lived in communion with the Roman Church, expressed sentiments irreconcileable with the doctrine it designates. Bernard, abbot of Clairval, in his sermon on the purification of the Virgin, says, "the body of Christ, in the Mystery, (Sacrament) is the food of the mind, not of the belly." In another sermon: "Even to this day, the same flesh is exhibited to us, not corporally, but spiritually." Rupert, of Duyts, the most distinguished commentator of this age, expressly teaches, that "the effect produced on the bread by the Holy Spirit in consecration, is not the corruption nor destruction of its substance, but is an invisible addition to its abiding substance, of what it had not before—so that it becomes the body of Christ by a hypostatical union with his soul."†

Gratian, the canonist, says, in the canon, In illo, "Christ is in the Sacrament, yet not in a corporal, but in a spiritual manner." In the canon, Quia Corpus, "When thou goest to the altar to be fed with spiritual meat, behold by faith the holy body of thy God; touch him with thy un-

---

* Larroque, pp. 711—719.—† Cosin's Hist. of Transub. 12th cent. Du Pin, vol. ii. p. 385.

derstanding,—lay hold on him with thy heart. The Lord having to ascend into heaven, did, in the day of the Supper, institute the Sacrament of his body and blood, that having been once offered as our price and atonement, it might be perpetually honoured in a mystery, and that his enduring offering might continue in *remembrance*, being contemplated and considered (fide non specie) by faith, not by appearance, and pondered by inward affection, and not by outward sight." In the canon, De hac quidem: "No man is permitted to eat of the host Christ offered upon the altar of the cross, but rather of that other, which is admirably made in *remembrance* of it." Peter Lombard, dignified with the title, Master of Sentences, endeavoured to solve all difficulties upon this subject, and is often inconsistent with himself, from attempting to reconcile contradictories. He affirms that "the substance of bread is converted into the body of Christ, and the substance of wine into his blood;" but adds, in the next section, that if it be asked what kind of conversion it is, whether formal or substantial, or of some other kind, he replies, "I am not able to define."* This confession was made about the middle of the twelfth century, by the acutest of the logical divines, and proves that theologians had not then attained to the notion of transubstantiation. Lombard also taught, that the wicked, as well as the righteous, partake sacramentally of the flesh Christ received from the Virgin, which is mystically and spiritually received only by the righteous. This is inconsistent with itself, and irreconcileable with transubstantiation. And, after all, Lombard declares, that "Christ is not sacrificed in the Mass in deed and in effect, but in a mystery;

---

* Lombard's Sentences, book iv. sect. 9, 10, 11; see also Mornay on the Euch. p 469.

and that it is not properly a sacrifice, but a *representation* and *memorial* of a sacrifice." We conclude our notices of this century, with mentioning Otho, bishop of Frisigen, who was as distinguished by learning and piety, as he was illustrious by birth. Contrary to the Romish doctrine, which annihilates the substance of bread in the Eucharist, he affirmed that "the bread and wine remain."

Cent. XIII.—The new term Transubstantiation was introduced into discussions regarding the Eucharist, in the preceding century, by Celles, bishop of Chartres, Stephen, bishop of Autun, and was used also by Peter, of Blois.—We noticed Bossuet's pretended demonstration, that the Waldenses held the doctrine indicated by that term till their deputies were won over to the Protestant side, at the conference they had with Oecolampadius and Martin Bucer.—Besides the proofs formerly given, of the utter futility of Bossuet's attempt, we find another very decisive fact, in the beginning of this century. As the simplicity of doctrine which the Waldenses professed, was adorned by purity of life, their numbers increased rapidly and extensively, and awakened the utmost Pontifical jealousy and hatred. Legates, preaching friars, inquisitors, and soldiers, were all engaged in the work of their conversion and extirpation.—About the year 1206, the Pope's legates had a conference with the Waldensian Barbs, or Ministers, one of whom, Arnold Hot, proposed to maintain, in opposition to the representatives of his Holiness, "that the Mass and Transubstantiation were human inventions, and not ordinances of Jesus Christ." Finding that conferences and confiscations, that preachments by friars, and persecutions by fire and sword, were ineffectual to check the progress of the Waldensian Church, the Pontiff at last resolved to try whether the terror of papal thunder might not produce the desired effect.

Accordingly, Innocent III. summoned a Council, to meet in Lateran in the year 1215. Four hundred bishops, eight hundred abbots, and ambassadors from almost all the princes in Europe, assembled. The Council was opened with a sermon by the Pope. Instead of proceeding thereafter to deliberate and discuss the subjects brought forward, this flagitious and imperious ghostly despot, who used to say that the pontifical authority was as much superior to the regal as the sun is to the moon, commanded them to read the canons he himself had prepared. In the first canon, the sacramental bread and wine are declared to be transubstantiated into the body and blood of Christ; the third canon declares all who do not embrace the faith described in the first to be heretics, and enjoins them to be excommunicated, anathematized, and extirpated. Severe penalties are threatened against all bishops and temporal lords as shall be remiss in searching out heretics, and extirpating them; their lands are promised to those who are active in their destruction; and similar indulgences are granted to them as to the Crusaders to the Holy Land.— It was this Council, also, that first enacted that all persons, after attaining to the years of discretion, shall make auricular confession to the priest: it also instituted the odious tribunal of the Inquisition. "The decrees of this Council seemed (says the historian, Mathew of Paris,) tolerable to some of the prelates, and grievous to others." The privilege of due deliberation and free discussion not being enjoyed, many members of Council felt that they were called together solemnly to sanction, by a silent acquiescence, the arbitrary and intolerable dictates of the imperious Pontiff. Disgusted with the part they had to act, they soon became desirous of leaving Rome, and succeeded in obtaining permission to depart. The imposing grandeur that this great

Council at first exhibited, therefore, soon dwindled into insignificance; and in less than a month it broke up altogether, in ridicule and scorn, leaving all the great objects for which it had met unaccomplished. For Platina, the biographer of Innocent III., Mathew of Paris, and other historians, inform us, that many things fell under consultation in this Council, but that nothing was properly or openly defined. The canons, therefore, that the Pope had prepared and caused to be read in Council, had not obtained its sanction when he was constrained to dissolve it, and lay aside his cares for the Church to attend to the wars and disorders of Italy. With this design, he left Rome shortly after, and died at Perusa: moreover, the canons of this Council of Lateran were not published till more than two hundred years thereafter.*

The doctrine of Transubstantiation was, therefore, not yet established by the authority of a general Council; but though it wanted this, it lacked not a variety of other influential means of dissemination and support. If the belief of the most absurd and impious doctrine ever named in the world was to be enforced, the diabolical Inquisition was instituted for the accomplishment of that end: if it wanted all appearance of truth to recommend it, it wanted not innumerable monks to preach it. If they wanted reasons to convince the understanding, they frequently had the power to perplex it with dialectical subtleties filched from Aristotle.† They endeavoured to compensate for the intrinsic weakness of their arguments by tales of false miracles and

---

* Coventry's Strictures on the Mass, p. 108.—† It is remarked by Whately, in his "Errors on Romanism," that Transubstantiation would never have appeared in any thing like its present form, had the Schoolmen not studied the writings of Aristotle.

lying wonders. One tells that an image of our Saviour is covered with sweat; another, that an image bows the head; another, that a wooden crucifix, being pierced in the side, spouts blood;—or that a host upon the altar assumes the form of a child, and is hewn in pieces by an angel; that another host, being wounded by a spear, distils drops of blood, but, being thrown into a caldron, is changed into a man. A Saxon Prince vouches that he once saw hosts changed into little infants, when the priest thrust them into the mouths of the communicants. An historian informs us, that the consecrated host having fallen rose itself, and mounted, in the shape of a fine little boy, upon the linen with which the priest wiped his hands; then suddenly became a tall man, wearing a crown of thorns, and two drops of blood trickling down each side of his nose; nay, it was even said that the host being presented to an ass, he immediately left his provender and worshipped it. Could any one doubt of transubstantiation after such evidence as this! Or if he did, how could he hope to shelter himself from the scowl and scrutiny of the merciless Inquisitor? Could any one be utterly insensible to the dread of the inhuman tortures inflicted within the walls of the infernal prison? Would the lurid glare, from time to time, cast upon the sky by the *auto da fé*, produce no dismal fears, nor render men more pliant in their creed? Would not the promises of the lands and possessions of heretics,—of absolution from all sins, and of plenary indulgence, be irresistible temptations to the ambitious, fiery, and, withal, superstitious spirits of the crusading soldiery, and render them zealous and powerful teachers of transubstantiation? And would not the people learn it with more docility, when they viewed the scenes of havoc and desolation which these warrior missionaries spread around them,—when they saw the lands wa-

tered with the blood of their friends, and their homes possessed by their foes. Thus every thing that could stimulate the ambitious, tempt the covetous, excite the wonder of the credulous and superstitious, and overawe, not the timid merely, but every one who had not the high courage and principle to contemn all earthly things, and brave even the terrors of death in its most awful forms, was employed in this century to disseminate and establish the Popish Faith, and exterminate the enemies of transubstantiation. But notwithstanding the vigilance and rigour of the Inquisition, and the slaughter of more than two hundred thousand in a few months by Count Mountfort's army, the Waldenses persevered in bearing illustrious testimony to the truth.

We have little more to add, than that the Waldenses, under other names, were spread throughout the north of France; and that, besides their dissent from the doctrinal errors and other corruptions of the Romish Church, even her own doctors and dignitaries were not themselves agreed about transubstantiation. It appears, from a letter of Innocent III. to John, archbishop of Lyons, that this prelate's mind was perplexed with various difficulties about the Eucharist: and, moreover, that the Pope himself was unable to tell into what the water, then usually mixed with the wine, was transubstantiated. A letter was written in the year 1268, by Clement IV. to the archbishop of Narbonne, his former friend, expressive of continued regard, but at the same time of deep regret, that it was reported that he had stated in the Court of Rome, in conversation with a certain doctor, "that the body of our Lord Jesus Christ is not essentially in the Eucharist, but only as the thing signified is in the sign;" and added, "that this is the celebrated opinion of the Parisian divines." The Pope then exhorts him to retract that opinion, and "to teach that the true body,

though locally in heaven, is really, truly, and essentially, under the species of bread and wine;" lest injurious suspicions should be entertained against him. The archbishop, apprehensive perhaps for his dignity, denies the charge, asserts his conformity to the belief of the Church; and says, "that the species of bread and wine are called his body, from their resemblance, but improperly,—that the material body he took of the virgin, and which was crucified, is his proper body,—that this name is sometimes applied to the Church in its mystic unity,—and that it also means the spiritual flesh of Christ, which is meat indeed; so that it is said of those who eat spiritually of this flesh, that they receive the true flesh and blood of our Lord." It would be an arduous task to reconcile these statements with transubstantiation. In the year 1270, the bishop of Paris, with the advice of certain doctors in divinity, condemned several philosophical maxims, one of which was, that for an accident to be without a subject, as is believed in the Eucharist, is an impossibility, and implies a contradiction. This maxim must have been entertained at Paris, or why was it condemned? Hence there is cause for suspecting that the saying imputed to the archbishop, was not destitute of foundation.

Cent. XIV.—In the conclusion of the preceding section, a surmise was expressed, that Transubstantiation was not received into the creed by the celebrated Faculty of Theology in Paris. We find this to be fully verified by a dispute now to be noticed. About the year 1305, John of Paris, a preaching friar, taught that *transubstantiation* was *not an article of faith*, and maintained that it had not been so determined by any sacred canon, nor by the church, nor general Council, nor by the Pope; he protested, at the same time, that if it could be proved to be sanctioned by any of these authorities, he would cheerfully retract all he had

said. Some contended for the opposite opinion, and hence the matter was debated before the Faculty of Theology.—The decision that learned body pronounced was, "that the manner of the real existence had not been determined; that, therefore, the conversion of the substance of bread into Christ's body, though a probable opinion, was not an article of faith; and that, if any one should venture positively to assert it, he should incur the sentence of anathema."—The bishop of Paris, however, having consulted some other mitred heads about this dispute, thought fit to enjoin silence upon Friar John, under pain of censure. Confident in the goodness of his cause, John appealed to the Pope, who appointed judges to try the case, but he died before the day of trial came. These historical facts are highly important. Could such a proposition have been made in the bosom of the Roman Church, or such procedure have taken place upon it, if transubstantiation had been her undoubted doctrine for thirteen centuries? If it had, might not innumerable proofs of it have been collected from such a length of time? Why was it not shewn that it had been positively decreed, and distinctly recognised, by Popes and Councils? Why did the most enlightened Theological Faculty in Europe judicially declare that it had never been determined, and that he was worthy of censure who should venture to say so? Why did the Pope, when the appeal was made to him, appoint judges to try the question, if it had been notoriously known through the Universal Church, during nearly thirteen hundred years, to be a decided question, and an article of faith? Were the case of John of Paris to come before the present Pontiff, Gregory XVI., would he appoint judges to determine whether transubstantiation is an article of faith? Certainly not.—It may be thought strange that no mention was made of the

canons of Innocent III. in the fourth Council of Lateran. But this omission probably proceeded from the opinion that they were of no authority, because, though they were read in Council, yet that it had broken up without defining or determining any thing.

Without doubt, the opinions of Romanists, at this period, upon the doctrine in question, were very various. Some received it without hesitation or reluctance; and some of the most learned men, while they were willing to regard the arbitrary and unconfirmed decree of Innocent as obligatory, nevertheless argued strenuously against the doctrine it established, as most irrational. Of this latter class was Dun Scotus, surnamed the Subtle Doctor. He reasons against Christ's body being contained under the species of bread and wine, after the following manner: "The quantity does not permit it, nor the locality and circumscription of place, which necessarily and naturally belong to a true and natural body, such as our Lord's body:—that, as a temporal thing cannot be in different times at once, no more can a local thing be in different places at the same time; therefore, the opinion that the bread and wine remain in their substance, seemeth the more probable, and not the less worthy, of being embraced."

Durand, of St. Porcian, surnamed the Most Resolute Doctor, says, "If it be granted, that the substance of bread and wine remain, there necessarily arises one difficulty, namely, how can two bodies be together and not be too big? But if the contrary be granted, many difficulties follow, namely, how can accidents nourish, be corrupted, or have any thing engendered in them?"

Holkot, an English divine, put this supposition: "Had there been a thousand hosts in a thousand places when Jesus hung upon the cross, he must have been crucified in

a thousand places. We ought not, therefore, to multiply difficulties, but to endeavour, according to Scripture, to clear and explain what is dark and obscure. Therefore, when there is a way obviously possible and may be understood, and another that cannot be conceived nor understood, the former ought to be chosen and retained," &c. Thus "it is most clearly to be understood, and is in all probability possible, that the substances abide and continue, and contrarily for the contrary." This author further asserts, "that few men in his age were persuaded that the body of Christ was really and transubstantially in the sacrament of the altar." Had transubstantiation been as favourite a doctrine at Oxford (where Holkot flourished) in those days, as it is at Blair's and Maynooth at the present time, would Holkot have been permitted to argue against, as above, or to make the bold assertion, that few men in his time believed it? To which side the University inclined, was manifested in the case of Wickliffe. He had entered it at an early age, and was in his twenty-fifth year when Holkot died; so that he might have frequently heard such argumentations and assertions which the latter made.

Wickliffe soon distinguished himself among his illustrious contemporaries—Occam the Singular Doctor, Bradwardine the Profound Doctor, and Chaucer the father of English poetry. By the vivacity of his genius, and the shrewdness and vigour of his understanding, he acquired high reputation both as a philosopher and divine. From his assiduous and devoted application to the study of the Holy Scripture, he was designated the Gospel Doctor. Having censured the vices of the monks and clergy with great freedom, he incurred the hatred and harrassing persecution of the Pope and his prelates, but was effectually shielded from their power by his patron the Duke of Lancaster, and others of

the English nobility. Undismayed by the storm that raged against him, Wickliffe, from censuring the vicious practices of the Romish Church, proceeded to expose her heretical pravity. Amongst other things, he reprobated the usurped power of the Pope; maintained that, by Scripture, he had no more power over the keys than any other priest; condemned the doctrine of transubstantiation, and taught that "the venerable sacrament is naturally bread and wine, but is sacramentally the body and blood of Christ." Enraged at Wickliffe's bold procedure, Archbishop Courtney appointed a court of select bishops and doctors, to which he summoned him to attend, and take his trial. The plot of his enemies to waylay him being discovered, he, by the advice of his friends, declined attending personally; but a letter was addressed by the University to the Select Court, giving Wickliffe an unqualified recommendation for learning, piety, and *orthodox* faith. Several doctors, also, appeared before the Court and defended his doctrines. The converts to these, by this time, were so numerous, that it is said two men could not be found together but one was a Wickliffite.

In the beginning of this century, we saw the celebrated Theological Faculty of Paris approving the opinion of John of Paris, who maintained that transubstantiation was not an article of faith; and now, towards the end of it, we see the University of Oxford, also renowned for its learning, defending Wickliffe, who denounced it as irrational, unscriptural, and impious, and commending him for the orthodoxy of his faith.

A Greek author, Nicolas Cabasilas, archbishop of Thessalonica, deserves to be included in our notice of this age. He wrote an Exposition of the Liturgy, in which he contends for consecration, by the invocation of blessing and

giving of thanks. He entertained the strange fancy, that the bread and wine are changed into the body and blood of Christ, which suffered under Pilate. Yet, he did not argue for a change of *substance*, but said that these "sanctified gifts" represent to us a suffering Saviour, who is present in *memorial;* and that this memorial of him respects not the manifestation of his miraculous power—shewing that he was God, and could do all things—but his human infirmity,—cross, passion, and death. "For (saith St. Paul to the Corinthians) as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death." Romanists hold that transubstantiation is contemporaneous with the pronouncing these words, This is my body. To say, therefore, that consecration is made by the invocation of blessing, is to ascribe the conversion of bread into the body of Christ to words which they do not regard as productive of that effect. Cabasilas, in his 29th chapter, ably exposes the Romish error, that consecration takes place after the communicants are bid *take, eat*, by the uttering of the words, This is my body. He even affirms, that no apostle nor doctor is known to have said that our Lord's pronouncing of these words was sufficient to constitute consecration. On this account, his Latin interpreter says, "the Greek schismatic raves."

A great effect was produced upon the continent by the writings of Wickliffe. They were carried into Germany by Mr. Payne,—into Bohemia by the attendants of Anne, Queen of Richard II., and by a young Bohemian nobleman, who put them into the hands of John Huss,—and they were extensively circulated by Lord Cobham: in consequence of which, the Wickliffites, or Lollards, as they were called in contempt, soon became exceedingly numerous. Though Huss was a great admirer of Wickliffe, and

though charged in the Council of Constance, with denying transubstantiation, which condemned him to the flames, yet, there is good reason to believe, that he never renounced that doctrine: however, many of his followers did abjure it. Enraged at his cruel fate, they retired to a mountain, which they called Tabor, and there celebrated the Lord's Supper in both kinds. Hence they were designated Taborites.—Their confession of faith was drawn up in A.D. 1431; and it is there stated, "that the bread retains its true nature of bread, and that it is the body of Christ, not by material identity, but sacramentally, really, and truly." On this account, Enaeus Sylvius, accuses them of having joined the impious and insane sect of the Vaudois. The Waldenses and Lollards of this age had to endure many a fiery trial—they were destitute, afflicted, tormented—they wandered in deserts, and in mountains, and in the dens and caves of the earth—and tho' they were outcasts from men, yet, what from the dissemination of their doctrines, and what from the glaring and monstrous corruptions in the hierarchy itself, the call for the reformation of the infallible Church, both in its head and members, became loud and general. The Council of Constance was assembled for this important purpose, but, after depriving the laity of the communion cup—after burning Huss and Jerome alive—and, after consigning the still more dangerous enemies, the writings of Wickliffe, to the flames, it terminated, merely acknowledging that the Church ought to be reformed in its head and members. This object continuing to be demanded with urgent importunity, a Council met at Basil in 1431, which began to reform with zeal and vigour. This greatly alarmed and displeased the Pontiff, who, therefore, issued a decrée, dissolving it; but it continued its sittings, and pronounced against him the sentence of contumacy. There-

upon he assembled an opposition Council at Ferrara, thundered out an excommunication against that of Basil; which, in return, deposed him from the Popedom, and elected a new Pope, Felix V., in his stead. The deposed Pontiff, with his Council, removed from Ferrara to Florence. Here a union was formed between the Greek and Latin Churches. The article relating to the Eucharist, in this deed of union, is thus expressed: "We declare also, that the body of Jesus is truly consecrated in the bread—corn." This is not consistent with transubstantiation, for, the bread—corn, is not said to be consecrated into Christ's body, but, that his body is truly consecrated in the bread—corn. Does not this imply that Christ's body existed in the bread—corn, before consecration, and that the substance of bread—corn, remains, after the sanctifying act?

The Greek Church rejected this union altogether, and even the deputies themselves, who had been engaged in making it, denounced it, upon their return to Constantinople, and declared that all things had been carried on by artifice and fraud, in the schismatic Council of Florence.

Eugenius IV., though acknowledged only by one portion of the Latin Church, and declared to be under sentence of deposition by another, yet fondly cherished the flattering conceit of being Pope Universal. In compliance with his solicitations, deputies came to Florence from the Patriarch of the Armenians. After they had some private interviews with some cardinals and doctors, they received the Pope's decree, usually called the Instruction of the Armenians.—As this document proceeded, not from the Council, but from the Pope only, it exhibits no compromise, as in the case of the Greeks, and accordingly asserts that, "by virtue of the words of Christ, the substance, bread, is converted into the body of Christ." A deputy also appeared on be-

half of the Ethiopians, but what business he did nobody knows. Probably he might be recommended to believe all that the Church believes, and to anathematize the rival Pope and Council of Basil. Two years after, the same ambitious and schismatic Pontiff framed Constitutions for the Syrians, Chalcedans, Nestorians, and Maronites, and gave them, as Du Pin informs us, to some *persons calling themselves deputies* on their behalf. This method of establishing Pontifical catholicity, reminds me of the great argument for Roman catholicity, used some years ago by a renegade priest, who, after apostatising from the English Church, entered the Popish Communion, visited Rome, and then contended, that he was certainly within the true Catholic Church at last, because people of all nations might find confessionals at Rome, and a priest to shrive them.—But unfortunately for this argument, all nations are not disposed to avail themselves of so useless a privilege. The obtrusive decretals of Eugenius IV., had the similar misfortune of not finding the churches, for whom they were framed, disposed to receive them.

Cent. XVI.—The fire, the sword, and the inquisition, had been most successful in the preceding age in extirpating the opponents of papal corruption. Yet a remnant of witnesses for the truth had still escaped, and found refuge from persecution in the desarts, and within the barriers of the mountains. The Pontiffs never reposed in more profound tranquillity, their power was never less disputed, nor was the seeming security of the hierarchy ever greater, than during the latter part of the fifteenth, and the early part of the sixteenth century. But, nevertheless, the era was now come, when light should arise in darkness, and the strongly compacted papal fabric be shattered to pieces. The era of the reformation had arrived. Luther in Germany, and Zuingle in

Switzerland, began, in the year 1517, that Religious Reformation, which rent asunder the empire of ghostly despotism, and formed the solid basis of our civil and religious liberty. Around these new and intrepid defenders of the pure doctrines of the Bible, princes and peasants, and the scattered remnants of the Waldenses, and other spiritual worshippers of the living and true God, gathered, so that they increased mightily. Whole nations quickly arose, and protested against image worship, purgatory, transubstantiation, and other erroneous dogmas and superstitious ceremonies, with which the Roman Church had encumbered and corrupted Christianity. Various fruitless efforts were made to arrest the progress of Protestantism, and to reduce its propagators into subjection to the Roman Church. For the adjustment of differences, and for the determination of disputes about doctrine, a Council was called together at Trent, by the Pope's indiction; however, none but his partisans attended. —Transubstantiation was decreed and defined in Session XIII., in these words: "If any one says, that in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, the substance of bread and wine remains together with the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and denies this admirable change of the whole substance of bread into the body, and the whole substance of wine into the blood of Jesus Christ, the species only of bread and wine remaining, which change the Church very properly calls *Transubstantiation*—let him be anathema." In Session XXII. of this Council, the Mass was the subject of discussion. The first question was, "Whether the Mass was a bare commemoration of the sacrifice upon the cross, and not a sacrifice?" Several passages of Scripture having been alleged to prove the Eucharist a sacrifice, George d'Ataida, a Portuguese divine, entered into an examination of these passages, and shewed that none of them prove

the Eucharist to be a sacrifice; then he proved it, by unanswerable argument, to be the memorial of a sacrifice. "Our Saviour (said he) did not offer a sacrifice when he offered this Sacrament, for then the oblation of the cross would have been superfluous, because mankind would have been redeemed by that of the Supper that went before. Besides, the Sacrament of the altar was instituted by Christ for a memorial of that which he offered upon the cross; now, there cannot be a memorial but of something past; therefore, the Eucharist could not be a sacrifice before the oblation of Christ upon the cross, but shewed what we were afterwards to do."—This speech gave great offence, and he found it advisable to leave the Council without delay.—Another question raised, was: "Whether Christ offered himself, in the Supper, a propitiatory victim to his Father, and whether the Mass be a propitiatory sacrifice?" Hereupon the bishop of Veglia argued, "that if Christ had not become obedient to the death of the cross, he had not made propitiation for our sins; and, therefore, the oblation in the Supper was not propitiatory."—His discourse made such an impression, that almost all the Fathers affirmed, that they ought not to say that Jesus Christ offered a propitiatory, but only an Eucharistic sacrifice in the Supper. Thus, then, we find men in this very Popish Council approving of our Protestant sentiments; but the decision that was given neither corresponds with these speeches, nor agrees with our sentiments. For it is decreed in Canon III. that "if any one says, that the sacrifice of the Mass is only a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, or a bare memorial of the sacrifice that was completed upon the cross,—and that it is not propitiatory nor profitable to any but him that receives it,—and that it ought not to be offered for the living and the dead, for their sins, their punish-

ments, their satisfactions, and their other necessities,—let him be anathema."

The propagation of these doctrines in the oriental churches was subsequent to the proclamation of these decisions.—The Jesuit Missionaries were the agents, and the powerful influence of the Inquisition the efficacious means, by which they were enforced; but all the Syrians and Armenians who were exempted from these hateful intruders, and from the terrors of the Inquisitor's tribunal, continued in their ancient faith. The Syrians had only two sacraments; and the Armenians expressly maintained that the consecrated bread and wine are figures and resemblances of Christ's body and blood. About the year 1629, Cyril, patriarch of Constantinople, drew up a Confession of Faith for the Greek Church, which has the following explicit statement relative to the Eucharist. After having recited the words of Institution, he affirms, "That is the simple, true, and lawful institution of this admirable sacrament, in the administration of which we confess and believe the true and firm presence of the Lord Jesus Christ; nevertheless, it is offered and made present to us by faith, but not that which transubstantiation vainly invented and teaches: for we believe that the faithful eat, in the Holy Supper, of the body of Jesus Christ our Lord, not by sensibly bruising, and breaking, and destroying him with the teeth in the participation, but in partaking with the perception of the soul. For the body of Christ is not that which is taken and is seen with the eyes in the Sacrament, but that which faith spiritually receives, and presents, and communicates to us. Therefore it is true that we eat it, and are made partakers of it, if we do believe; but if we do not believe, we lose all benefit of the Sacrament. For the same reason we believe, that to drink the cup in the Sacrament, is to drink the

blood of Christ Jesus our Lord, in the same way as has been said concerning the body. For the law given made the same precept about his blood as he did about his body, which precept must not be mutilated according to each one's caprice, but the tradition prescribed to us must be kept sound and entire. When, therefore, we have partaken worthily, and communicated entirely, in the Sacrament, of the body and blood of Christ, we make this profession that we are already reconciled and united to our Head, and made one and the self-same body, with a firm hope that we shall be made co-heirs with him in his kingdom."

I conclude this narrative with summarily remarking, that Transubstantiation is a novel doctrine,—that it was totally unknown to antiquity,—was first proposed in the Council of Lateran in the year 1215, when the Inquisition was also instituted to compel the reception of it,—was debated in the schools,—was embraced by many, and was rejected by not a few, of the most illustrious scholars,—was at length received by the sacrilegious Council of Constance, but was never defined nor accredited with plenary Papal sanction, till the canons of the Council of Trent were framed in the year 1551, when the denial of it was anathematized; and that it appears to have been nowhere introduced at first, without being enforced by the terrible Inquisition.

THE

ANATOMY OF THE MASS.*

CHAPTER I.

The Institution of the Holy Supper, by Jesus Christ, according as it is contained in the Apostle Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians, Chap. xi. 23—29.

"*For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread: And when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat; this is my body which is broken for you: This do in remembrance of me. After the same*

---

* Cardinal Baronius, and some few others, proposed to derive the word Mass from the Hebrew word Missach; but in this surely they manifested more anxiety to discover the most respectable source to which it may be ascribed, rather than to determine whence it really came. Had there been a Hebrew word applied to the Holy Supper in the Apostolic age, would it not have continued in use like Paschal, Hosanna, Hallelujah, and some others, which are adopted into all the various languages of Christians. Bellarmine, Binius, Salmeron, Durand, and very many others of inferior note, concur in deducing it from the Latin word Missa, which is now universally admitted to be its true derivation. As in Pagan rites, the uninitiated were dismiss-

manner, also, he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the New Testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it in remembrance of

---

ed (saith Salmeron, tom. 16, p. 390—391) before the celebration of the mysteries, by the word Ilicet, (a contraction for Ire licet,) so our word Missa is from Ite Missa est, denoting the dismission of the catechumens, and all, except the communicants, before the celebration of the Holy Supper began. This was the sense in which it was understood by Fathers, Councils, Canonists, and Jesuits. It is not a word of primitive antiquity, for Ambrose, who flourished during the latter part of the fourth century, is the earliest author whom Bellarmine quotes as having used it. That Ambrose really did so is somewhat uncertain; for it is admitted by all that many things have appeared in his works which are not authentic. And Masson says, that the most ancient author in whom he had read the word Mass, was Leo I. This word then was not introduced into the Christian Church till the period when her mode of worship was encumbered and disfigured by her unholy adoption of various Pagan rites. To the meaning affixed to Mass in the ancient Fathers and Liturgies, we may produce the testimony of Maldonat, who, quoting Isodore, says, that Mass was so called from the dismission of the catechumens before celebrating the Eucharist, from which he justly infers, that Mass cannot mean Sacrifice. Bellarmine admits that "there is no mention made of this word by the Greeks, who, (he affirms,) instead of it, used the word Liturgy." But the Latin word corresponding to λειτουργια is officium. Quod nos vulgo vocamus officium, id Graeci appellarunt —λειτουργιαν. (Bullin. de Orig. Error.)—We subjoin the learned Casaubon's exposition of the ecclesiastical uses of this word Liturgy: "The practice of the church hath appropriated this word, λειτουργειν, to the public service and worship of God, but in various ways. According to Dionysius, the Areopagite, the Deacons are called λειτουργοι. In the books of the Fathers, mention is made of the morning and evening Liturgy; and in the Acts of the Council of Ephesus, Balsamon remarks, that Liturgy consists in prayer alone, without the administration of any sacraments, and is sometimes specially applied to the celebration of the Eucharist, of which there are two parts—Recitation of the Scriptures, and Administration of the Supper. (Justinian's 7 Novel.) What Bellarmine says, as often as this word is applied to sacred things, and is used absolutely, it is taken for the service of sacrifice, is a notable error; for in the example, in Luke i. 23, which he subjoins, λειτουργια is not a sacrifice, but a general word, comprehending all sacerdotal and Levitical ministrations.—Zacharias, as Luke saith, executed the priest's office—not of sacrificing, but of burning incense—in the order of his course. Nor does he err less when he says, that this word is scarcely used by the Fathers otherwise than for the service of the sacrifice."

The sacrifice of the Mass was, therefore, totally unknown in the

me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come.— Wherefore, whosoever shall eat this bread and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup. For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body."

St. Mathew adds (Chap. xxvi. 22.*) these words of the Lord: "But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom."*

And in verse 27 *it is written, that "Jesus gave the cup to his disciples, saying, Drink ye all of it."*

CHAPTER II.

Thirty-four contrarieties between the Holy Supper and the Mass; and how much the Romish Church hath departed from the Institution of the Lord.

No one can deny that our Lord Jesus Christ instituted

Greek Church. It is quite vain for Romanists to contend, as they do, that Mass implies sacrifice. Here is one opposing authority they might be expected to respect. Pope Innocent III. says, (B. 6 de Myst. Altaris,) "the service (officium) is divided into the Mass of the Catechumens, and of the faithful. The Mass of the Catechumens lasted from the entrance till after the offertory, and is called Mass from dismission, (ab emittendo,) because the Catechumens were sent out of the church, when the priest began to consecrate the Eucharist." But there was no sacrifice before consecration; Mass, therefore, does not, as Bellarmine argues, imply sacrifice: "The Mass of the faithful is from the offertory till after the communion, and is called Mass, (a demittendo,) because the faithful were then dismissed to their own homes." From this explanation of Mass by Innocent III., it appears that this name can be given to the service (officium) only by synecdoche, its proper meaning being simply dismission; its Greek correspondent, therefore, is not λειτουργια, but αφεσις. R. S.

the Holy Supper as it ought to be; and it would be impious to find fault with his institution: consequently, the shortest, indeed the only, way to settle all our differences, would be to return to the institution of Jesus Christ, to speak as he spoke, and do as he did. That is what we desire and demand with so much eagerness, and to which the Roman Church will not consent; for the Council of Trent, Session XXII., denounces Anathema to all who shall say that there is any error in the Canon of the Mass. It is evident, however, that the Mass is nothing else than an alteration and disfigurement of the institution of the Lord. Of these, we shall give some examples:—

I. Jesus Christ, instituting the Holy Supper among his disciples, spoke in a language intelligible to his hearers. On the contrary, the priest in the Mass speaks in a language which the people do not understand.

II. Jesus Christ presenting the cup to his disciples, said, Drink ye all of it. And St. Paul commands the people of Corinth (1 Cor. xi. 28.) to drink of the cup, saying, "Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup." And, (1 Cor. x. 17.,) "We are all made partakers of one bread and of one cup;" according to the version of the Roman Church, the only one authorised by the Council of Trent.

III. Jesus Christ, in celebrating the Eucharist, neither spoke of sacrificing his body, nor of making any offering to God his Father. On the contrary, the Priest in the Mass pretends to sacrifice the body of Jesus Christ, and to offer him to God, a propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead, without commission or commandment from God.

IV. Jesus Christ, in the Holy Supper, did not elevate the host; nor did the apostles adore the Sacrament, but remained seated at the table. On the contrary, the Priest

in the Mass elevates the host above his head, that it may be worshipped by all the people.

V. Jesus Christ did not put bones and relics of saints under the Sacred Table; nor did he ask the remission of sins from God, on account of the merits of saints whose relics were under the table. On the contrary, the Priest in the Mass, kissing the altar, addresses God thus: "We pray thee, Lord, for the merits of thy saints, whose relics are here, that thou wouldst deign to pardon me all my sins."*

VI. Jesus Christ said to his apostles, Take, eat. On the contrary, private Masses are chanted in the Roman Church every day, in great numbers, at the instance of those who pay for them, without communicants and without auditors, in which the Priest says, "Take, eat;" but there is no person to take and eat. Even in the public Masses, the Priest often eats and drinks alone.

VII. Three Evangelists, Mathew (chap. 26), Mark (chap. 14), and Luke (chap. 22), and St. Paul (1 Cor. chap. 11), testify that Jesus gave bread to his disciples, saying, "He took bread and brake it, and gave it." But the Sacrament is not dispensed till after the consecration. Jesus Christ, therefore, gave bread after the consecration. Paul declares three times in the eleventh chapter, "that we eat bread;" and in the tenth he says, "that we break bread." And in Acts (chap. 22) it is said, "the disciples came together to break bread." On the contrary, the Roman Church teaches that, in the Eucharist, we do not eat bread nor break bread; but that that which the Priest

---

* Oramus te Domine, per merita Sanctorum tuorum quorum reliquiæ hic sunt, et omnium Sanctorum ut indulgere digneris omnia mea peccata.

breaks in the Mass, is the body of Jesus Christ, which nevertheless cannot be broken.

VIII. Jesus Christ, in giving the bread, said, This is my body, declaring that the bread which he gave was his body. On the contrary, the Roman Church teaches that the bread is not the body of Christ; and that the bread is no more bread, but is transubstantiated into the body of Christ. Now, in what respect the bread is Christ's body, he himself informs us, by adding, That it is his commemoration. In the same way, he says, in the line following, that "the cup is the New Testament," because it is the sign and commemoration of it: according to the style of Scripture which usually gives to signs and memorials, the name of that which they represent and signify.

IX. Jesus Christ called that which was in the cup "fruit of the vine," saying, "I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine." On the contrary, the Roman Church teaches, that that which is in the cup is not fruit of the vine, but blood, and says, that not only the true blood of Jesus Christ, but that also his body, his soul, and his divinity, are in the cup, and that his whole body is entire in each drop of the cup. Whence it follows, (and the Roman Church believes it,) that Jesus Christ drank his own flesh, and swallowed his own soul and his own body, and did eat himself, and had his own head in his own mouth.

X. The Evangelists testify, that Jesus having taken the bread, blessed it. But, according to the doctrine of the Roman Church, which annihilates the substance of bread in the Eucharist, Jesus did not bless the bread; for to destroy a thing and reduce it to nothing, is not to bless it.

XI. Jesus, breaking the bread and distributing it, said, in the present tense, "This is my body, which is broken—

Κλωμενον—for you." Whence it appears, that by his body he meant the Sacrament or commemoration of his body. For the natural body of Jesus Christ could not break itself. To evade the force of this argument, the passage is corrupted in the Latin version of the Roman Church; and instead of these words, "which is broken for you," it is rendered, "which shall be delivered for you;"* having put "deliver" for "break," and the "future" for the "present." And assuredly our opponents find themselves very much embarrassed to tell us what it is that the priest breaks in the Mass. Does he break bread? But they say the bread is no more. Does he break the body of Christ? But it cannot be broken, and they themselves say, that there is a whole body in the smallest crum of the host, as great and bulky as it was upon the cross. Does he break the accidents of bread, namely, *the taste, colour, and roundness of the host, which they deceitfully call species?* But these things are not broken for us. Such accidents cannot be broken. Can one make pieces of taste, or of whiteness? Nothing but bodies are capable of being broken.

XII. The Apostle Paul, conforming himself to the institution of the Lord, says, that "the bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ." (1st Cor. x.)—The Roman Church contradicts every word of this sentence. The Apostle says, It is bread. The Roman Church, on the contrary, says, It is not bread. The Apostle says, That the bread is the communion of the body of Christ. On the contrary, the Roman Church says, That the bread is the very body of Christ. Here, then, is a clear exposition of these words, "This is my body," given by the Apostle, viz. "The bread which I break is the

* Quod pro vobis tradetur.—1st Cor. xi. 24.

communion of my body ;" and not that which the Romish Church gives, namely, " That which is under these species is transubstantiated into my body."

XIII. It is specially to be observed, that the same Apostle, in the same chapter, ver. 21, contrasts the table of the Lord and the table of devils. The propriety of the contrast shews clearly, that as to partake of the table of devils is not to eat devils, but to partake of the meat consecrated to devils, so likewise, to partake of the table of Jesus Christ, is not to eat Jesus Christ, but to partake of the meat consecrated by him in commemoration of himself and his death.

XIV. Jesus, in distributing the bread and the cup, said, " Do this in remembrance of me." These words clearly shew, that the priest does not make nor sacrifice Jesus Christ in the Mass; for it is impossible to make Jesus Christ in remembrance of Jesus Christ,—it is impossible to sacrifice him in remembrance of himself. Can one build a house in remembrance of the same house ? Did Aaron sacrifice a lamb in memorial of that lamb ? Besides, a memorial can only be of things absent and past, as saith St. Augustine, " Nemo recordatur nisi quod in praesentia non est positum.—One can have remembrance only of that which is not present." The Council of Trent, indeed, declares, that Jesus Christ, by these words, " DO THIS," commanded that he should be sacrificed in the Mass. But besides, that Jesus cannot be sacrificed in remembrance of himself, the Apostle Paul, immediately after these words, " Do this in remembrance of me," adds the explanation, saying, " For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come." Would you therefore know what it is to " DO THIS ?" St. Paul in-

forms us, that "to eat of this bread and drink of this cup," is to shew the remembrance of Christ's death.

XV. Our Lord Jesus broke the bread before pronouncing the words Romanists call Consecration. He took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, saying, "This is my body, which is broken for you." Whence, by the doctrine of the Romish Church, it follows that he broke unconsecrated and untransubstantiated bread. The priest in the Romish Church, on the contrary, breaks the host after consecration, to make the people believe that he breaks and sacrifices the true body of Jesus Christ. Our opponents, therefore, confess that the priest does not break the same thing which Jesus Christ broke. Some, to defend themselves against the Apostle, who says, that "the bread which we break is the communion of the body of Christ," affirm that St. Paul says, "we break bread," because, when he administered the Holy Sacrament, imitating the example of Christ, he broke before consecrating, and consequently broke unconsecrated bread. But those who say this, oppose the Roman Church, which does not believe that the breaking of unconsecrated bread can be the communion of the body of Christ.

XVI. The same Apostle (1st Cor. xi. 28,) says, "Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat OF that bread;" which is the same manner of speaking that Jesus Christ used, saying,—πιετε εξ αυτου παντες—"Drink ye all OF it." The Apostle commands us to eat OF this bread, that is to say, to take each his part: and Jesus Christ, saying, "Drink ye all of it," commands the communicants to take their part of the cup. This manner of speaking is become absurd in the Roman Church, which, by the "bread," understands Christ himself. For he would be thought a fool or a profane jester, who should say, that we eat of Jesus Christ, or that each takes his part of Christ's body.

XVII. Jesus Christ, presenting the cup to his disciples, said, in the present tense, that it was his blood, which is shed for many. Here he manifestly speaks of a Sacramental, and not of a real effusion. For our opponents confess, that the blood of Christ does not issue from his veins, and that there is no outward shedding of it in the Mass.—He speaks, therefore, of a Sacramental effusion, relative to the real effusion on the cross. We ask, then, does the priest drink, in the Mass, of the blood that came out of Christ's side and wounds upon the cross? If they answer, the priest does not drink of that blood which came out of his body upon the cross, but of that which remained in his body, and is there still, they thereby confess that he does not drink of the same blood which Jesus intended that we should drink; for he expressly commands us to drink of the blood shed for us. But if they answer, the priest drinks the same blood that the Lord shed upon the cross, then they rashly take for granted, without a particle of authority from the word of God, that the blood which came out of the Lord's body entered into it again. All this abuse comes from not considering, that in the Holy Supper the body of Jesus Christ is represented to us; and is presented to our *faith*, as suffering, broken, dying, and dead for us, and his blood, as shed and poured out of his body. Instead of which, the Roman Church thinks she receives Christ's spiritual and glorious body, and his blood enclosed in his body and veins.

XVIII. The apostle Paul (1 Cor. xi.), and St. Luke (chap. xxii.), testify, that Jesus said, "This cup is the New Testament in my blood." If by the word cup blood ought to be understood, the sense of the words will be, "this blood is the New Testament in my blood." By this means,

Christ must have two sorts of blood, the one of which is in the other.

XIX. Jesus Christ, in celebrating the Holy Supper, said, " This do in remembrance of me." And St. Paul said to us above, that in eating this bread, we shew or publish his death. On the contrary, the priest in the Mass says, that he celebrates the memory of the Virgin Mary, saying, " Communicantes et memoriam venerantes imprimis gloriosæ semperque virginis Mariæ—communicating and venerating, in the first place, the memory of the glorious and evermore Virgin Mary," leaving Jesus Christ in the background. As Gabriel Biel saith, in the thirty-second lesson of the Canon of the Mass, " We make commemoration, firstly and chiefly, of the most blessed Virgin Mary, because she is the very sure refuge from our calamities; and hath been the minister and very liberal dispenser of this sacrifice, and the whole ground of our hope."

XX. In the whole institution of the Eucharist, there is no mention made of Saints, and there is no command to pray to Saints; no mention of the intercession of Angels. On the contrary, in the " Confiteor " of the Mass, the Priest begs Michael the Archangel, John the Baptist, and all the Saints, to pray for him. There are Masses where the Litany is recited, which is only a long series of prayers to saints. In the Mass, they bless the incense by the intercession of Michael the Archangel. The priest beseeches that God would command his angel to take the consecrated host, and carry it to heaven. And to crown the abuse, in the Offertory of the Mass, the Priest says, that he makes this oblation in honour of the Virgin Mary and the Saints; as if the Holy Supper were instituted in honour of creatures. That assuredly is to place the Saints above Jesus

Christ. As when one gives alms in honour of God, he takes for granted that God is more excellent than the alms.

XXI. St. John testifies, that in the action of the Holy Supper, the devil entered into Judas; but our adversaries, with the greater part of the Fathers, hold that Judas partook of the Eucharist with the other disciples. They must hold, therefore, that Jesus Christ and the devil both entered at the sametime into Judas. Thus they give to Jesus Christ a very unsuitable companion; and assuredly the Son of God and the devil would have been very ill lodged together.

XXII. We are in accord with our adversaries on the point, that Jesus Christ ate and drank with his disciples, and partook of the Sacrament. He shews this effectually himself, when, having given the cup, he said, "I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine." It thence follows, according to the doctrine of the Roman Church, that Jesus ate himself, and swallowed his body and soul, and had his whole body in his own mouth and stomach. By this means, Christ's passible body devoured his impassible body. It would be desirable to know what the body of Christ did in the body of Christ; and how his soul could enter into his body, seeing it was there already. And since that which contains, and that which is contained, are different things, and since nothing can contain itself, it is evident that, by this doctrine, two bodies are given to Christ—one of which is contained in the other. And since eating one's self is a more wonderful thing than the creation of the world, it is not credible that Jesus would eat himself, unless something were to result from the act highly advantageous to our salvation. Our opponents, however, produce none. To support this extravagant doctrine, which exposes the Christian Religion to so much ri-

dicule, our opponents quote a passage from Augustine, upon the thirty-third Psalm, where he says, "that in the Sacrament, Jesus Christ carried himself in his own hands." Yet Augustine does not say merely that he carried himself between his own hands; but, ipse se portabat quodam modo cum diceret, hoc est corpus meum,—he carried himself in a certain manner, when he said, This is my body. Thus a man who carries his portrait in his hands, carries himself in a certain manner. As it would be utterly nonsensical to say, that the moon is the moon in some manner, so, also, if what Christ carried between his hands was his true body, would it be a great absurdity to say, it was his body in some manner. For as to the meaning of these words, "This is my body," Augustine explains them very clearly, in his book (chap. 12) against Adimantus, declaring that "the Lord made no difficulty of saying, This is my body, when he gave the sign of his body."

XXIII. Our Lord Jesus sat at the table with his face turned towards the audience. On the contrary, the priest in the Mass stands before an altar with his back towards the people.

XXIV. Jesus Christ gave to each of the disciples a morsel of the bread he had broken with his hands, which they received with their hands. In the ancient Christian Church, both men and women received the Sacrament with the hand, under both kinds. The contrary of all this takes place in the Mass, in which the Priest thrusts a round unbroken wafer into the mouth of the communicants. If a woman happen to touch, I do not say the host, but simply the linen, or the chalice, or the patine, it would be esteemed a great crime, and a profanation of sacred things.

XXV. Our Lord Jesus Christ instituted this Sacrament for the remission of sins, and for shewing forth his

death. (Math. xxvi., 1 Cor. xi.) On the contrary, Masses are chanted in the Romish Church for the solace of the sick, for the success of a voyage, for the protection of vines against hoar frost, and for the recovery of a diseased horse, &c. The Priests make their profit of all this: for he at whose instance Masses are chanted must pay for them.

XXVI. The Apostle Paul calls the Holy Sacrament the Lord's Supper, (1 Cor. xi. 20,) of which we find only one kind; but the Romish Church hath invented a thousand kinds of Masses. There is the Mass of the Holy Spirit, of St. Giles, of Pope Linus, of St. Francis, &c. Amongst others, there is the Mass of St. Catherine and St. Margaret, saints who never were in this world, any more than St. Ursule, St. Longis, St. Christopher, and many others, who have been sent to heaven without ever having been on earth. There are likewise High Masses and Low Masses,—Great Masses and Little Masses,—Dry Masses, —Episcopal Masses,—Masses in white, others in green, and others in violet.

XXVII. Jesus offered no prayer for the dead in the Holy Supper. On the contrary, there is a prayer offered for the dead in the Mass, in which the Priest prays for the dead, who "sleep in the sleep of peace."* This ought to be carefully observed; for it shews that when this prayer was added to the Mass, there did not as yet exist any belief in purgatory. For those who are burning in a fiery furnace during many ages, do not sleep in peace.

XXVIII. The confession, also, that the Priest makes in the Confiteor of the Mass, is very remote from the Institution of the Lord. For the Priest there confesses his sins

---

* Qui dormiunt in somno pacis.

to God, and to the Virgin Mary, and to John the Baptist, and to Peter, and to Paul, and to all the other Saints.—There is none omitted but Jesus Christ.

XXIX. In the Mass of Good Friday, the image of the cross is worshipped with that supreme adoration called Latria, which is due to God alone, saying, "Behold the wood of the cross, Come, let us worship it." It is also said in the anthem then chanted, "We adore thy cross, O Lord!"—and addressing the cross, "Faithful cross, alone noble among the trees," &c. This is said to an inanimate thing, which does not hear.

XXX. There are images on the altar, as also in all other places of the Church, the adoration of which is commanded under pain of anathema, by the second Council of Nice, and by the Council of Constantinople, reckoned the eighth General Council, and by many Popes, and is commonly taught by the Jesuits.

XXXI. Jesus Christ celebrated the Holy Supper with all simplicity; but the priests of the Roman Church chant Mass with allegorical dresses full of mystery, and with a thousand turns and gesticulations, very unbecoming the holinesss of this ordinance. They amuse the eyes of the people, because their ears are useless to them.

XXXII. There is one manifest falsehood in the Canon of the Mass; for the priest says, that the Lord, having taken the Cup into his hands, said, "This is the Cup in my blood of the new and eternal Testament mystery of the faith." Contrary to the testimony of the Evangelists, in whose writings these words are not found, Pope Innocent, in the chapter, "Cum Marthae de celebratione Missarum," says, that the Church holds it from tradition, which he will have men to believe, though it be contrary to the Gospel.

XXXIII. Jesus Christ pronounced all that he said in

the celebration of the Sacrament in an audible and intelligible voice. He did not mutter what are called the consecrating words, as is now done in the Roman Church, which differs in this point, as in many others, from the Greek and Oriental Churches, in which the consecrating words are pronounced aloud. Pope Innocent III., in the Mysteries of the Mass, (b. iii. c. 1,) and Durand, in the Rational, (b. iv. c. 35,) give the reason of this change, namely, that it happened one day, that some shepherds, having learned the consecrating words, pronounced them over their ordinary bread, which was immediately changed into flesh : God being provoked at this, sent fire from heaven, which consumed them. However, there are many ways of telling this fable : it is not said where or when the thing happened, nor is there any evidence adduced for it, nor do the relators agree even about the story itself.

XXXIV. Jesus Christ did not command his disciples, after they had received the Sacrament, to put the remaining fragments into a box, and preserve them, to be carried about and paraded in great pomp through the streets, as is now done by the Roman Church on Corpus Christi day and its Octaves. This festival was instituted by Pope Urban IV. A.D. 1264, as his successor, Pope Clement V. testifies, in the Clementines, (Tit. 16,) where the epistle of Urban instituting it is inserted, in which he says, that he was moved to do it, " by a revelation made to some Catholic persons."* By Catholic persons he meant a nun of Leige, named Eva, with whom he was acquainted when he was archdeacon of Leige. This woman said, that God had revealed to her

* Binius notis in Concilia in Vita Urbani IV. et ex Molano et Petro Premonstratensi. Vide Serarium de Proces. b. ii. c. 9, et Epistolam Urbani IV. ad Evam.

that he did not esteem it right that each of the saints had his festival, and that God had none. This festival would, nevertheless, have gone into lasting desuetude, had not Clement V., about forty years afterwards, instituted it anew.

CHAPTER III.

In what manner the change in the Institution of the Lord hath altered the nature of the Sacrament—and that there is no Consecration in the Mass.

The horrible change and depravation in the Institution of the Lord, has entirely abolished the nature of the Sacrament; for Sacraments are sacred signs. Not the ancients only, but even the doctors of the Roman Church, define Sacraments "Sacramentum est sacrum signum." Thus, in baptism, water is the sign, and the blood of Christ is the thing signified; and, in the Holy Supper, bread and wine are the signs, but the body and blood of the Lord Jesus Christ are the things signified. If the water of baptism were entirely taken away, there could neither be a sacrament nor baptism. In like manner, the Eucharist in the Roman Church is not a sacrament, because the signs, namely, the bread and wine, are abolished, and the natural body and blood of Jesus are substituted in their stead, and are called Sacrament. Moreover, the Council of Trent ordains,* that the Sacrament be worshipped. And thus, as Bellarmine† and others maintain, Jesus Christ, in the Mass, is by this means made the figure and sign of himself; as if one should

* Sess. XIII. ch. 5.—† Bellar. de Euch. b. 2. c. 24; Christus sui, ipsius figura fuit.

assert that a man is the portrait of himself. Besides, the sacraments were not instituted for the purpose of bringing Christ down to us, but of elevating us to him. He is not given to be mangled with the teeth, but is set forth for the nourishment of our souls, and the strengthening of our faith.

Further, the consecration of the Sacrament is abolished by transubstantiation, and there is nothing in the Mass capable of consecration. The bread is not consecrated; for it is held that it no longer exists. The body of Christ cannot be consecrated by men. The qualities of bread and wine cannot be consecrated, for lines, colours, and tastes, are not the sacrifices which is pretended to be offered unto God. There being, therefore, nothing consecrated, there is no consecration, and where there is no consecration there is no Sacrament.

CHAPTER IV.

That by the change in the Institution of the Lord, the Roman Church hath changed the Nature of Jesus Christ.

The change signified by transubstantiation is carried so far, that the human nature of Jesus Christ is entirely abolished and destroyed. For the Scripture, speaking of Christ's human nature, says, that he was like unto us in all things, yet without sin; but the Roman Church ascribes to him a body, which is in no respect like ours: whence it follows, that he is no longer our brother, so that all the glory of believers, which consists in having a brother, who is the eternal Son of God, is entirely swept away.

The Roman Church invents a body for Jesus Christ,

which exists in many different distant places at the same time; which is in heaven and on many altars, but is in no point of intermediate space,—whence it follows, that the body of Jesus Christ is separated and far from itself, and is higher and lower than itself. There is no less absurdity in supposing that a human body may be in divers distant places at the same time, than in supposing that a man may be in two different years at the same moment, and thus be old and young at the same time, and outlive himself.

By this doctrine, a human body is ascribed to Jesus Christ, which is quite entire in each crumb of the host,—which has the feet and the head in the same place, and the two eyes exactly in the same point. Can that body, the parts of which are not external the one of the other,—have no difference of situation,—occupy no place,—and are more spiritual than spirits,—be called a true human body? It is on this account that the priests of the Roman Church shave the beard on the upper lip, for it is believed, that if a priest should dip his mustaches into the cup, the whole body of Jesus would remain suspended at each hair. This doctrine, likewise, invents two bodies for Jesus Christ, to which belong contradictory properties: for that body of Jesus, which was at the table celebrating the Eucharist, spoke and moved the hands; but that which was in the mouths and stomachs of the apostles, did not speak nor move the hands. That soul of Christ, who was at the table, was in agony; but the soul of the Christ which was in the mouths of the apostles, suffered no sorrow. When Jesus rose from the table, he entered into the garden, and did sweat great drops of blood, but that Jesus who was in the stomachs of the apostles, did not sweat drops of blood. Which of these two is our Saviour? Or, if they be one and the same Christ, how is he diverse from himself?

Further, by this doctrine, the whole history of Christ's life is rendered ridiculous, and turned into fable. For, if the body of Christ can be in divers distant places at the same time, might it not be said that whilst he was in the womb of the virgin, perchance he was likewise in other wombs,—and that whilst he was on the cross, he was walking in Spain? From this doctrine, it likewise follows, that all the journeys he made, going and coming from Gallilee into Judea, were useless; for wherefore should he go from Gallilee into Judea, if he could be present in both the one and the other at the same time, and could shew himself in Judea without moving from Gallilee? What, say you, cannot the Almighty do that? I answer, that without doubt, God can do all things if he will; but that it is impossible that God can will these things, for he is not a liar, and cannot contradict himself. Yet he would contradict himself if he willed that a man should speak and not speak at the same instant, that he should move and not move, suffer and not suffer, and be diverse and distant from himself. It pleased God to constitute the body of Christ a true human body. God doth not will any thing so absurd and contradictory as that imagined by some, namely, that in the host accidents exist without a subject, and that, according to Pope Innocent III.,* in the host there is greatness and nothing great, colours and nothing coloured; as if one should say there was an eclipse of the sun and no sun,—lameness in the leg and no leg,—sickness and no one sick. Besides, the will of God, not his omnipotence, is the rule of our faith. In like manner, one might defend all the fables of the Alcoran, by saying, God is able to do it. Yet God never acts but in wisdom; and assuredly, now that

* De Myst. Missae. L. iv. c. 11.

Christ is glorified, he will never subject Jesus to sinful men, and to the reproaches they would cause him to suffer every day: but more of this hereafter.

CHAPTER V.

Concerning the audacity of the Jesuit Maldonat, in contradicting Paul and Luke, and correcting Matthew and Mark—and concerning the Fruit of the Vine.

Of all the terms used by our Lord in the institution of the Eucharist, there are none that have perplexed our opponents more than those he spake in giving the cup: "This Cup is the New Testament;" and those in which he called what was in the cup "fruit of the vine." For, as we shall afterwards see, they are constrained to acknowledge, that in the words, "This Cup is the New Testament," there is a *figure* like that in the words, "This is my body,"—and to confess that the cup is called Testament, because it is the sign and commemoration of it. Besides, it is altogether improbable, that Jesus Christ called his blood "fruit of the vine."

Against these words of the Lord, "This Cup is the New Testament," recorded by Luke and Paul, the furious Jesuit, Maldonat, rages with a most impious audacity, and speaks of these two organs of the Spirit of God, as liars, who have not related the word of the Lord faithfully; and would have us to believe the testimony of Matthew, who said, "This is my blood," and to reject that of Luke and Paul, who testify that the Lord said, "This Cup is the New Testament." The following is his comment

upon Matth. xxvi. 28: "There is no need of many words. I deny that Jesus Christ used these words; for, since Matthew, who was present, and Mark, who learned from him, both wrote, that Christ gave his blood with these words, 'This is my blood of the New Testament,' it is reasonable to believe that Christ used the words of Matthew and Mark, rather than those of Luke and Paul." And a little after, maintaining that it was Christ's intention to give his real blood, he speaks of Luke and Paul, as not having comprehended the purpose of Christ, saying, "Luke and Paul seem to speak as if Christ's chief design was to declare, that he gave the New Testament, rather than his blood." He adds, "though we should even *feign* that Christ spoke as is written by Luke and Paul," &c.

Assuredly it is an intolerable presumption to dare to contradict an evangelist and an apostle, Luke and Paul, saying, "I deny that Christ spoke these words," thus constituting himself judge of the fidelity of the apostles, deciding which of them was the more credible; and thinking to excuse Luke and Paul, by saying, it was necessary to *feign* and suppose what was not. Every man, who has any remnant of modesty or fear of God, will rather choose to believe, that all the evangelists and apostles are equally worthy of credit, and that all of them have spoken truth; for if we admit that any of them have given false relations, the rest of Scripture will possess only a suspicious and doubtful authority. But, even though we should admit that Luke and Paul have varied the words of the Lord in some degree, we should, nevertheless, be constrained to believe that they were incited thereto by the Holy Spirit, in order to illustrate the words of the Lord,—to divert men's minds from gross ideas,—and to deprive the spirit of error of every occasion for inventing a transubstantiation.

This Jesuit having thus maltreated Luke and Paul, commenting afterwards on these words, "I will drink no more of the fruit of the vine,"* ranks himself on the side of Luke, in opposition to Matthew and Mark; and affirms that Jesus Christ said these words, I will drink no more of the fruit of the vine, pointing to the paschal cup, contrary to the testimony of Matthew and Mark, who relate that Jesus spake these words over the cup of the Holy Supper. By this he certainly makes Jesus Christ a liar, for after the paschal cup he drank of the sacramental cup which contained wine.—Our Lord spoke contrary to truth, if, in drinking of the cup of the paschal lamb, he said I will drink no more of the fruit of the vine, since he drank of it shortly after.—Besides, Matthew and Mark make no mention of the paschal cup, consequently they do not call that fruit of the vine which might be in a cup whereof they did not speak. On this point Maldonat has antiquity, Popes, Councils, and even Jesuits for adversaries, who maintain that these words I will drink no more of the fruit of the vine, ought to be understood of the Sacramental cup. Cyprian writes, (63 Epistle,) "The Lord said, I say unto you, I will not henceforth drink of this fruit of the vine, until the day I drink it new with you in the kingdom of my Father.—Herein we find that it was a mixed cup that the Lord offered, and that what he called his blood was wine."

The Council of Worms acknowledges, in the fourth chapter, that "there was wine in the mystery of our redemption, when the Lord said, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine."† Pope Innocent III. asserts, in the Mysteries of the Mass, "that it was manifestly wine which

---

* Mald. in Math. xxvi. 29. — † Apud Ivonem, part ii. fol. 65.

Christ consecrated in the cup, because he added, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine."* The Catechism of the Council of Trent holds the same doctrine in the chapter on the Eucharist: " The Catholic Church has always taught, that the Saviour used wine in the institution of this Sacrament, seeing that he himself said, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine." The Jesuit Salmeron held the same opinion.† It was likewise maintained by Vasquez, on the third part of Thomas, " I think that Christ said these words, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, concerning the cup of his blood."‡ To prove this opinion, he has recourse to the Fathers.

CHAPTER VI.

Of the great dishonour done to Jesus Christ by this doctrine,—of the indelible character,—and of the power of creating our Creator.

The mere artifices practised in the Mass, are alone sufficient to expose the abuse, and make every man shudder with horror who loves the Lord Jesus. At the end of the old Roman Decretal, there are added various penitential Canons, the thirty-ninth of which runs thus: " When a mouse eats or gnaws the body of Jesus Christ, look the second distinction of the consecration towards the end, for the penance prescribed for this case."

At the beginning of the new Missal, revised and corrected by the Pope's authority, there is a treatise

---

* L. iv. c. 27.—† Salm. tom. ix. Treat. 14.—‡ Disput. 96, c. 4.

on the accidents that may happen in celebrating the Mass, which contains the following rules: "If the host disappears by some accident, such as being carried away by the wind, or by some miracle, or hath been eaten by some beast, and cannot be found, then another may be consecrated, recommencing at the Qui pridie of the Mass."* And in the tenth chapter: "If a fly or spider fall into the cup, and if the Priest's stomach do not nauseate it, and he have no fear of danger, let him swallow the fly or spider with the blood." In the same chapter (sec. xi.) it is added, "if the blood freeze in the cup in winter, let it be wrapped in warm linen." Mark these words, "if the blood freeze." While Jesus is in heaven in great glory, it is proposed to thaw him on earth. Let them tell us of what body or substance that is which is frozen in the cup; for ice certainly is a body. But the most remarkable passage found in this chapter, is the following: "Should the Priest vomit the Eucharist, and the host appear whole, he must eat it again with reverence, provided it does not produce nauseous loathing; for then it would be necessary to wipe it carefully, and to deposit it in the shrine of relics."

Pope Innocent III. broaches a very important question in the fourth book of the Mysteries of the Mass. He asks, if a priest who has nothing in his stomach but consecrated wafers, is seized with dysentery, quelle est la matière qui sort de son corps? From this difficulty the Pope adroitly extricates himself, saying, with the Apostle, "Let no man think himself wiser than he ought, but let him think soberly."

By these things it appears that God, incensed against

---

* De defectibus cir. Miss. Occur. c. iii. sec. 7.

men who have rejected his word, hath stricken them with stupidity. For who would ever have believed that Christians were reduced to such a pass as to worship a God that might be stolen, or carried away by the wind, so that it might be said, *God is lost*,—a God that might be gnawed by mice, or devoured by beasts,—a God that is besmeared with vomitings and must again be eaten,—a God that may fall but cannot rise,—a God, of whom the doctors* say, that under the host he can neither open his eyes nor move his hands; and that he neither lies, nor sits, nor stands. Our adversaries say, that though mice carry off the consecrated host and eat it, or though a beast devour it, Christ, nevertheless, suffers neither injury nor pain. But they cannot deny that he is thereby exposed to ridicule, and to the sufferance of greater ignominy than what he endured upon the cross; for to be eaten of beasts, to be vomited and besmeared with vomitings, is more ignominious than to be crucified. Turks and Pagans will say, is that the God of the Christians, whom dogs devour, and who cannot defend himself against mice? God assuredly will never subject the glorious body of his Son to such disgrace, unless some great benefit were thereby to result to the Church. But our opponents cannot tell us how Christ's being carried away by mice, and his being devoured by beasts, can be beneficial to our salvation.

Cardinal Tolet the Jesuit affirms, in the "Institution of Priests," (b. ii. c. 25,) that the priest may consecrate several basket-fuls of bread, and a tun of wine. If he may consecrate one, he may also consecrate two, or ten, or twenty, and thus turn all the wine in the market into blood.

---

* Vasquez, in 3 part. Thomae Tom. 3, Disp. 191, c. 3.

Moreover, it is necessary to remark, that the Romish Church holds, that by investing with the order of priesthood, an indelible character is impressed upon the soul of the priest, which even the Pope cannot efface; and that a priest, degraded for heresy or other crime, may consecrate and transubstantiate bread into flesh, and wine into blood, in virtue of that character which he retains, though deposed from the priestly office. A priest, therefore, who has renounced the Roman religion, nay, a priest who is a sorcerer and magician, may transubstantiate tuns of wine into blood, and may cause the blood of Christ to be carried about in pints and bottles among all the tippling houses. This certainly is to put Christ into the power of magicians and drunkards, and to expose him to great disgrace. By this doctrine, the priests have got power over Christ, to make him, to lock him up, to carry him about, and to cast him into the fire if they will! The celebrated Doctor, Gabriel Biel, says, in the first Lesson on the Canon of the Mass, that "the priest hath great power over both bodies of Christ"—that is to say, over the Church, and over the consecrated host. Wherefore, he adds, "who hath ever seen any thing like this? He who created me, if I may so speak, hath granted me power to create him; and he who created me without me, is created by my means?" Thus, then, the priests can create Jesus the Son of God, and make him what he is already; which is like generating a child already born.

CHAPTER VII.

That the words of the Mass itself are contradictory to Transubstantiation.

Amid the alterations in the institution of the Lord, God

hath permitted some clauses to remain in the Mass, which plainly condemn transubstantiation; for, a great part of the Canon of the Mass consists of prayers which had been inserted before transubstantiation became an article of faith. —Thus, the priest, having the consecrated host and cup before him, says, "we offer unto thy excellent Majesty, of thy gifts and presents, a pure host." By gifts they now understand Jesus Christ himself. Assuredly no man in his senses ever called Jesus Christ *gifts* and *presents;* but, the use of the plural number agrees very well with bread and wine. The priest proceeds, saying, "deign to regard these things with a favourable eye." Is it not mockery to call the Saviour *these things?* Is it not crowning the abuse, to beseech God that he would regard Jesus with a favourable eye, as if he needed any recommendation of ours?

Further, the priest afterwards entreats God to be pleased to regard these gifts and offerings as equally acceptable as the offering of Abel, that is to say, that God would have as much respect to Christ's sacrifice of himself, as he had to the sacrifice which Abel offered of the firstlings of his flock. This prayer may, with propriety, be offered over bread and wine, but is downright blasphemy when offered in reference to Jesus Christ. This is strikingly manifest in what the priest says, when looking at the consecrated host and cup: "God, through Jesus Christ, always creates these *good things* for us, and sanctifies and vivifies them." Can Jesus be called *these good things?* Does God eternally create and vivify his own Eternal Son? And since God creates these things by Christ, as saith the Mass, it is certain that they are not Christ. But this language applies very well to bread and wine.

It ought not to be omitted, that when Jesus gave the bread to his disciples, he said simply, Take, eat. But, in

the Canon of the Mass, it is, Accipite et manducate *ex hoc* omnes—let all take and eat of it. Whoever added these words OF IT, (ex hoc,) did not believe that the Lord's body was really and orally eaten in the Eucharist, for to eat *of it*, is to eat a part, not the whole of it. This cannot be said of Christ's natural body.

CHAPTER VIII.

Recrimination of our Adversaries.

The prophet Elisha accused the Israelites of idolatry, and of having forsaken the covenant of the Lord. In revenge they called him bald head, a reproach which did not in the slightest affect the doctrine nor office of the prophet. We are in a similar condition with respect to our opponents. We accuse the Roman Church of having introduced idolatry in the Mass, by the adoration of the Sacrament, and a sacrifice of the body of Christ, which was not instituted by the Lord himself,—of having taken away half of the Sacrament from the people,—of having changed the nature of the Sacrament—verily, of Jesus Christ himself—which are important matters, and absolutely essential to the Eucharist, and to the Christian religion. But they, by way of recrimination, say to us, that we have also changed many things in the institution of the Lord. For, say they, you celebrate the Supper in the morning, but Jesus instituted it after supper; you celebrate the Supper in Church, but Jesus Christ celebrated it in an upper chamber; you admit women to the communion, but when Christ instituted the Eucharist, there were none present but men. The two first of these charges are matters of indifference, and all the three are

not merely not essential to the Sacrament, but do not even constitute any part of that service.

Jesus Christ furnishes us with an answer to objections of this kind, for he said, "Do this in remembrance of me."—He did not say, do it in this or the other place, nor at any particular hour, nor admit only a particular sex or person; but he said, do this, commanding us to do as he did, and to imitate his action. Christ did not exclude women. Had there been any present, worthy of receiving the Holy Supper, he would not have rejected them.

CHAPTER IX.

Of the causes wherefore the Pope will not allow any Change in the Mass, nor conform to the institution of the Lord.

The abuse is very glaring,—nevertheless, the Roman Church and the Pope will not recede one jot, nor suffer any thing in the Mass to be changed, the cause of which, it is not difficult to discover. If the Church of Rome were to consent to the least change, she would overthrow the three maxims that are the bases on which Popery is wholly founded. The first of these is, *that the Roman Church cannot err:* the second is, *that the Pope and the Roman Church are not subject to the Holy Scripture, and are invested with higher authority than the Scriptures:* and the third is, *that the Pope and the Roman Church have power to change the commandments of God, and to make new articles of faith.* This is not only practically evident in the Church of Rome, in that her whole doctrine is opposed to Scripture, but is apparent also from the decrees of Popish Councils, and the avowed profession of the chief Popish

doctors, from whom I shall quote some passages in the following chapter.

CHAPTER X.

Passages in which the Doctors and Councils of the Roman Church maintain, that the Pope and Church of Rome are not subject to Scripture—nay, that their authority is superior to Scripture; and that they have power to annul and abolish the Commandments of God.

The Roman Decretal and its glosses are pervaded with this fine maxim, that "the Pope can decide in opposition to an Apostle,—in opposition to the Old Testament;—that he can supersede law, being himself above law;—and that he can set aside the Gospel, by determining its meaning, according to his own pleasure.*

In the first book of the Decretals of Gregory IX. Tit. 7, c. Quanto personam, Pope Innocent III. asserts, that "the Pope holds on earth not the place of a mere man, but of the true God;" on which the gloss of the Doctors is, that "the Pope can make something out of nothing, and can make that obligatory which is not obligatory,—because in what he wills, his will stands in place of law, and none can say to him, Wherefore doest thou so? for he can dispense with

---

* Can. Lect. Dist. 34 in Gloss.—Papa dispensat contra Apostolum. Innoc. III. Decretal de Concessione Praebend. Tit. 8 cap. Proposuit. Secundum plenitudinem potestatis de jure possumus supra jus dispensare. Et ibi Glossa. Nam contra Apostolum dispensat. Item contra Vetus Testamentum. Et Glossa Canonis, sunt quidam Caus. 25, quaest 1. Papa dispensat in Evangelio interpretando ipsum.

law, and can make that just which is unjust." Thomas Aquinas, whom the Pope canonized, asserts, "that the Pope has the right, by his own authority, of framing a new edition of the Creed." (Thom. c. 2, q. 1, art. 10.) It was decided in the last Session of the Council of Florence, that the Pope can add to the Creed. One of the crimes for which Luther was anathematized by Leo X. was, his having taught, as may be seen in the Bull added to the last Lateran Council, "That it is not in the power of the Romish Church to ordain new articles of faith."

The title of one of the chapters of Cardinal Perron's book against the king of Great Britain, is "Concerning the authority of the Church to alter things contained in Scripture." (B. 3, obs. 3, ch. 3.)

The Jesuit Vasquez, in the third tome on the third part of Thomas, Disput. 216, speaking of this commandment of the Lord, "Drink ye all of it," says, "Although we should grant that this was a commandment of the Apostle, yet the Church and the Sovereign Pontiff have, nevertheless, power, for good reasons, to abrogate it; for the Apostles' power of making laws, was not greater than that of the Church and the Pope."

The Jesuit Salmeron, in his second Prolegomenon, declares, "it to be no marvel that Scripture is subject to the Church which hath the Spirit." (Tome ix., Treatise 13.) And, in arguing elsewhere about the change in the form of the Sacrament, he maintains, that "we are by no means bound to imitate Jesus Christ in all things, except in good morals." He thereby teaches us that we are not bound to imitate Jesus Christ in the Sacraments, nor in the Communion under one kind; nor in that he celebrated the Holy Supper in a known tongue; nor in the doctrine of Purgatory; nor in the Sacrifice of the Mass, &c.:—for these

things do not relate to good morals. The same Jesuit affirms, in his first Prolegomenon, that "the authority of the Church is more ancient and more noble than the authority of Scripture." Certainly this is declaring that men are above God. Can any one affirm, without impiety, that the Jewish Church was above the law which God wrote upon the two tables? Are subjects above the laws? Is the Pope not subject to the laws of God? Further, this Jesuit asserts, that "the Christian religion admits of additions to its essential doctrines."* Whence it follows, that Christian doctrine is not yet complete, since essential articles may still be added to it.

John Almain, the Sorbonnist, in his book upon Ecclesiastical and Lay Power, affirms, that "the Pope may permit things forbidden in the law of God:" in proof of which opinion, he quotes Panormitanus and Angelus.

Andradius, in his Defence of the Tridentine Faith, book 2, says, "The Roman Pontiffs, in defining many things which were previously obscure, have been accustomed to enlarge the Creed." And again: "It is manifest that they have not erred who say, that the Roman Pontiffs can sometimes dispense from obedience to the laws of the Apostle Paul, and from the decrees of the four first Councils." Further: "our ancestors, men excelling in piety, have broken and annulled many of the Apostolical decrees."

Bellarmine (De Pontif., l. 4, c. 5) teaches us, that "if the Pope should err in commanding vices and in forbidding virtues, the Church would be obliged to believe that vices are good and virtues are evil, if she would not sin against her conscience." The same author, writing against Bar-

---

* Salm. Tom. XIII. Part 3, Disp. 6.

clay, says, (chap. 31,) "Christ, in wisdom, gave to Peter (that is the Pope) power to make that to be sin which is not sin, and that which is not sin to be sin."

The Roman Decretal contains the following sentences in the 40th Distinction of the Canon—Si Papa: "If the Pope, being negligent of his own salvation and that of his brethren, draw innumerable people in crowds, along with himself, the first slave of hell, to be tormented for ever with many plagues, none dare blame his faults; because he, who is the judge of all men, ought not to be judged by any man, unless he has swerved from the faith."

The English Doctor, Stapleton, on the authority of Scripture, (b. ii. c. 11,) writes, "I have said, and again affirm, that the Church is the rule of Scripture." According to this account, sinful men ought to govern God, and are masters of God." Lindanus hath said, in the Index to the fifth book of his Panoply, that "the Church, by the will of God, is not subject to Scripture." But he is desirous, like others of his party, that the Church be subject to the traditions of the Church—that is to say, to the laws she enacts for herself. Now, by the Church, they always understand the Roman Church, and by the Roman Church the Pope.

The Jesuit Coster, in his Enchiridion, (c. i.) calls the traditions of the Roman Church another kind of Scripture, and maintains, that "the excellence of this Scripture doth much surpass the Scriptures which the apostles left unto us, written on parchment." The Jesuit, Gregory of Valence, says, in his Analysis, that "Scripture is not the judge of controversy." "Scripture is not a sufficient rule of faith." "By the secret judgment of God, Scripture is a rock of offence, and a temptation for the feet of fools, that they who would support themselves on it alone, may easily mis-

take and go astray." (L. iv. c. 2, 3, 4.) However, after having turned us away from Scripture, he sends us back to the Pope, saying, that "the sole authority existing in the Church, for determining controversies in matters of faith, resides in the Pope." This agrees with what Andradius says, in the first book of his Defence of the Tridentine Faith: "Our faith is included in and upheld by the faith of the Pope, on whose authority depends the salvation of all men." The Jesuit Gregory, not finding proofs in Scripture for the sacrifice of the Mass, says, in his first book (c. 4,) upon the sacrifice of the Mass, that "if this service was not instituted by God, these people must not, however, thence conclude that it is not lawful; for that (viz. its divine institution) is by no means requisite to constitute any act of worship or sacrifice acceptable to God." And in book ii. "I have shewn above, and in many other places, that it is not requisite to have the commandment of God to render a religious service acceptable." For these reasons, he affirms, in his Commentaries, (vol. iv.) "that things are better ordered in the Church in these latter times than they were in the first ages;" for he considers the Church as better instructed now than in the times of the apostles.

Of that power which the Roman Church arrogates to herself, to change, to break, and to abrogate the commandments of God, we have a remarkable example in the Council of Constance, held A.D. 1416, which was the first Council that took away the cup from the people. This Council acknowledged in Session XIII., that Jesus Christ instituted the Sacrament under both kinds; and that, in the ancient Church, the people received the cup, yet it had the audacity to say, "that in several parts of the world, some had ventured rashly to assert that the Christian people ought to receive the Sacrament under both kinds;"

as if there could be rashness in following the example of Jesus Christ. It then ordains that the Sacrament be henceforth administered to the people under the *kind* of bread only, and decrees that this custom be held for law, which none may either blame or alter. In the end it concludes, "that those who obstinately affirm the contrary, ought to be expelled as heretics, and severely punished." With equal audacity, the Council of Trent, speaking of the concupiscence forbidden in the law of God, and which Paul affirms to be sin, (Rom. vii.) declares and determines in Session V., that concupiscence is not sin in those who are regenerated, that is to say, baptized, and that there is neither truth nor propriety in St. Paul's sentiments. Whence it follows, that a baptized person may covet his neighbour's wife without sinning; but it would be a sin in an unbaptized person. I now leave to every unprejudiced person to judge with what reason our opponents call our religion a new religion, seeing that they themselves declare that they can change the commandments of God, add to the Creed, and make a new religion; and that they are not bound in the Mass to abide by the institution of the Lord.

CHAPTER XI.

That the exposition we give of these words, "This is my body," is conformed to Scripture,—to the nature of the Sacraments,—was attested by the Fathers, and is confirmed by our adversaries.

The interpretation we give of these words, "This is my body," is that which Jesus Christ himself gives in the same place, namely, "that *it is his commemoration*."—This agrees with that which Paul gives, (1st Cor. x.) "the

bread we break is the communion of the body of Christ." The Sacrament being a figure, there is nothing more suitable than to employ a figure drawn from the nature of the action, by which the name of the thing signified is given to the sign. In like manner, the Sacrament of circumcision is called the covenant of God,* (Gen. xvii.) because it is the sign or commemoration of the covenant. The Sacrament of the Paschal Lamb is called the Passover, because it was the memorial of the angel's passing by, and sparing the houses of the Israelites. Speaking of the rock out of which waters gushed in the desert, Paul says, that "the rock was Christ," because it was a figure of him. Augustine remarks, in the "City of God," (b. xviii. c. 48,) "that the rock was Christ, because it signified Christ." And in the fifty-seventh Question on Leviticus, "the thing which signifies commonly obtains the name of the thing signified, as it is written, seven ears of corn are seven years, and seven kine are seven years, and many other like instances. Hence it is that the rock was called Christ, as if it had really been in substance, what it was only by signification." Pope Innocent III. expresses the same opinion in the Mysteries of the Mass, (b. iv. c. 7,) "Petra erat Christus, id est, significabat Christum—the rock was Christ, that is to say, signified Christ." Thomas Aquinas, in his exposition of this Epistle: "The rock was Christ, not in substance, but in signification." And Lombard in his Commentary: "They drank of the rock that signified Christ." This is confirmed by the word *was*. But Bellarmine transposed these words, and translated thus, "Christ was the rock," which rendering would warrant the inference, that though Christ was the rock then, he is not so now.

* Ferus in Gen. Pactum hoc loco sumitur pro signo pacti.—Eman. Sa, prim. edit. notis. Pactum id est signum pacti.

The same Apostle says, in the Epistle to the Romans, vi. 4, "We are buried with him by baptism into death;" because baptism signifies that our sins are as it were buried with Christ, and that we ought to be conformed to his death. But not to go further, Jesus Christ, in giving the cup to his disciples, said, "This cup is the New Testament in my blood." Here there are two figures, as the Jesuit Salmeron justly remarks, (Tome ix. Tract xv. p. 98.) "There are in these words a double metonomy,—one by which the thing containing is put for the thing contained —that is to say, the cup for the wine contained in it; the other—that which is contained in the cup—is called the New Covenant or Testament, because it is the symbol or sign of it, on account of the species." And again: "The blood is called the New Testament, like as circumcision is called the covenant, because it represents the covenant."— Thomas Aquinas, in his Commentary on 1 Cor. xi., says, "This cup is the New Testament in my blood; as if he had said, by this which is contained in the cup commemoration is made of the New Testament, which was ratified by the blood of Christ." The Jesuit, Emanuel Sa, says, in the first edition of his Notes on 1 Cor. xi., that "the word IS is equivalent to contains or signifies." It is quite customary to say a suit of mourning, because it is the sign of mourning; and a celestial sphere, for the figure of a celestial sphere. In speaking of maps, of France we say this is France, and that is Spain; and of being lodged at the Eagle or Swan—*i. e.* at the sign of the eagle or swan. Thus Augustine, as already quoted, remarks: "The sign usually obtains the name of the thing signified." Theodoret, in his first dialogue, speaking of these words, "This is my body," says, "The Lord gave to the sign the name of his body." Tertullian against Marcion, (b. 4, c. 40,) says, "He

caused it to be his body, saying, This is my body—that is to say, the figure of my body." Augustine is very explicit in his 23 Epistle to Boniface: "If the Sacraments have not some resemblance to the things of which they are the Sacraments, they could not be Sacraments. It is on account of this resemblance, therefore, that they take the name of the things themselves. It is precisely thus, that the sacrament of the body of Christ is in some manner the body of Christ, like as the sacrament of faith—namely, baptism —is faith." Observe: he says that the sacrament of the body of Christ is the body of Christ in the same manner that baptism is faith. Our adversaries, therefore, display much ignorance when they say, that figures are elsewhere admissible, but that they are utterly unsuitable in articles of faith and in the institution of a sacrament, for we have produced several instances of figures being used in the institution of sacraments; and they themselves admit that there are two in these words: "This cup is the New Testament." And as to articles of faith, in the Creed it is said, that Jesus Christ is seated at the right hand of God, which is a figurative mode of speech, for God has no right hand. The whole Gospel is comprised in these words, "Jesus, the Lamb of God." And the whole Papacy is founded upon these words, "On this rock will I build my Church," and, "I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven;" which are all figurative expressions.

It is to be observed, that when Jesus instituted the Holy Sacrament, he spoke in the vernacular language of Judea, which was a dialect of the Syrians, saying, *hanau pagri*, that is to say, "This my dead body;"* supplying the word IS,

* 1 Sam. xvii. 46, Isaiah xiv. 19, 2 Chron. xx. 24, Gen. xv. 11, Num. xix. 29, shew that pagri signifies dead body.

according to the custom of the Hebrews and Syrians.* He therefore said to his disciples that he gave them his dead body. This was true only figuratively; for, the body of Christ was not dead when he instituted this Sacrament.—But, it is perfectly true in the sense in which we take it, namely, that the bread which he brake and gave to his disciples, was the figure of commemoration of his body, dead for us. For we have shewn above, that the body of Jesus Christ is presented to our faith in the Holy Supper, not as glorious and spiritual, but as broken, dying, and dead for us. What confirms this interpretation is, that the word σωμα, signifying body, is most frequently used by the evangelists to denote dead body. "Wheresoever the body is, thither will the eagles be gathered together." (Luke xvii. 37.) And "Many bodies of the saints which slept arose." (Mat. xxvii. 52.) And, μυρισαι το σωμα, to embalm the body. (Mark xiv. 2.) Πτωμα is the word that properly signifies dead body in Greek. In the Syriac Testament the word *Peger* is indeed sometimes used for a living body, but it is not credible that Jesus used the word in a sense different from what it bears in the Old Testament, where it always signifies a dead body. It ought not to be omitted that Paul often calls the Church the body of Christ. (Ephes. i. 23, v. 23.) If one would then infer from these words, "This is my body," that the bread is transubstantiated into the body of Christ, they may,

---

* "Had he spoken in Latin, (says Dr. Clarke,) following the idiom of the Vulgate, he would have said, Panis hic corpus meum significat; or, Symbolum est corporis mei,—hoc poculum sanguinem meum representat; or, Symbolum est sanguinis mei: this bread signifies my body; this cup represents my blood. But let it be observed, that in the Hebrew, Chaldee, and Chaldeo-Syriac languages, there is no term which expresses to MEAN, SIGNIFY, DENOTE, though both the Greek and Latin abound with them: hence the Hebrews use a figure, and say, IT IS, for IT SIGNIFIES."—M'GAVIN'S PROTESTANT, No. IV.

since the Church in Scripture is called the body of Christ, with equal propriety, infer that the Church is transubstantiated into Christ's body.

CHAPTER XII.

That our adversaries, to avoid a clear and natural figure, invent a multitude of others, harsh and uncommon, and do not speak but in figurative terms; and of Berenger's Confession.

Our adversaries, who ostentatiously pretend to be enemies of figures, do, nevertheless, invent a great number of violent and absurd ones, and even turn all into figure.—When Jesus said "This is my body," by *this* they mean an individuum vagum, or that which is under the species, without determining what it is. Others explain the word IS by SHALL, or shall become, because they say transubstantiation does not take place till after the words of consecration. When the Envangelists say, the Lord gave bread; by this word bread they mean flesh. And we have seen that they confess that these words, "This cup is the New Testament in my blood," are figurative. According to their doctrine, which puts the body into the cup, Jesus, in giving the cup, might say, "This my body," and would therein have said the truth, if we may believe them. Christ called what he drank in the Eucharist "fruit of the vine." But, by fruit of the vine, our adversaries would have us to understand Christ's blood. By these words, "Do this," they understand "Sacrifice me;" but the words following, "Do this in memory of me," refute that interpretation; for

it is impossible to sacrifice Jesus Christ in memory of Jesus Christ. We shall see hereafter that, when Christ says, (John vi. 53,) "Except ye drink my blood, ye have no life in you," our adversaries, fearing to be accused of taking life away from the people by taking away the cup, understand *eat* by the word *drink;* and when Christ says, "I leave this world, and I am no more of this world," they append thereto this gloss, namely, "by any visible presence."

We have seen above that the Apostle, in speaking of the Supper, repeats four times, We break bread—we eat bread. To evade the force of these words, they wrest them by figurative interpretations, saying, It is not bread which we eat, but the body of Christ is figuratively called bread, because it seems to be bread, which they know to be false, for the body of Christ never did seem to be bread. They likewise say it is called bread, because it was bread before consecration. This also is false, for the body of the Lord never was bread. Rhetoric has no names for such figures. By way of example they mention the rod of Moses, which was called a rod after it was changed into a serpent; and the water at the marriage of Cana in Gallilee, was called water after it had been changed into wine. But these examples make against them; for it is expressly said, that the rod became a serpent, (Exod. iv. 3,) and that the water was made wine, (John ii. 9.) But it is not said that the bread in the Holy Supper was changed into flesh. It might truly be said of the serpent that it had been a rod, and of the wine it had been water. In respect to the body of Christ, however, it never could be said that it had been bread. The substance of the body of Christ was not the same as the substance of bread, for it was not formed of bread, and never had been bread. Others affirm that the Apostle does not say, When ye eat bread, but when ye eat

of this bread, imagining that the pronoun *this* indicates a divine and spiritual bread. But they do not consider that in 1 Cor. x. the Apostle does not say "*this* bread," but "the bread we break;" and Luke says, (Acts xx. 7,) "the disciples were assembled to break bread." Their philosophy it at fault. They must also learn, that when the Scripture uses this word bread in a spiritual sense, it is never opposed to cup; because to eat and to drink mean the same thing, when spiritual nourishment is spoken of. Now Paul distinguishes between the bread and the cup, saying, "whosoever shall eat of this bread and drink of this cup."

If a man examine the terms which our adversaries use on this subject, he will perceive them to be full of unintelligible figures. They say that the priest breaks the host, and that the host is the body of Christ, which, nevertheless, cannot be broken,—they say that they elevate God, but God cannot be elevated,—they say that the consecrated host is round, and that it is the body of Christ; whence it follows, in sound reasoning, that the body of Christ is round. That it is so, however, they do not believe. They grant the premises, and deny the conclusion, which is contrary to common sense. And when they speak of drinking of the cup—by drinking they mean swallowing the flesh, and the bones, and the soul of Jesus Christ, together with his divinity.

The formulary of abjuration prescribed to Berengarius, by the Roman Council under Nicholas II., was drawn up in the best defined and most express terms that could be devised. These terms are "That he protests that he holds the doctrines of the Pope and the Romish Church, namely, that the bread and the wine upon the altar are not the Sacrament merely, but are also the true body and blood of

Christ."* These words must be understood in some way contrary to their obvious import, for the Romish Church does not believe that the bread is the real body of Christ. He was likewise caused to say, "that the body of Jesus Christ is sensibly handled by the priests, and is broken, and is grinded by teeth of the faithful." But the gloss of the doctors on these words is, "If thou dost not rightly understand the words of Berenger, thou wilt fall into a greater heresy than Berenger. It is the attribute of falsehood to entangle itself with figures, which it cannot unravel."

CHAPTER XIII.

Respecting the ascension and absence of the Lord, and the affirmation of our adversaries, who say, that in the Sacrament he is sacramentally present.

The glosses and figures of our adversaries are altogether intolerable, when they torture those passages of Scripture which speak of Christ's ascension and departure from this world. It is said by our Lord, (John xii. 8,) "the poor ye have always with you, but me you have not always."—Again, (xiv. 3,) "if I go away I shall come again;" referring to his coming to judgment. And (xvii. 11,) speaking of his approaching ascension as if it were past, he says, "now I am no more in the world." Peter declares, (Acts iii. 21,) "that the heaven must contain him until the time of the restitution of all things," that is till the day of judgment. All these passages are so many falsehoods, if we

* This Confession of Berenger is to be found in the Second Distinction of the Consecration, at the Canon, Ego Berengarius.

believe in transubstantiation; for in them Jesus declares, that he leaves the world; that he is no more in the world; and that we have him not always. But if we believe in transubstantiation, we must say, that Christ hath not left the world, but is much more in it than before his ascension; for before that event he was on the earth only in one place, but now it is pretended that he is present on a million altars, in a million boxes, and in a million stomachs. To evade that passage of Peter, which says, "that the heaven must contain him till the day of restitution of all things," in the Latin version of the Roman Church, it is rendered, "that the heaven must receive him," as if Christ had not then ascended into heaven at the time Peter spoke these words. It is not true that the heaven must continually receive Jesus Christ till the day of judgment. The Louvain Doctors, who translated the Bible into French, acknowledged that, and translated faithfully: "Whom the heaven must contain."* The Jesuit, Emanuel Sa, in his Notes on this place, says, "Recipere id est receptum continere, to receive—that is to say, to contain after having received him." As Christ must, therefore, be contained in heaven, he cannot now be on earth. They are not a whit more successful in extricating themselves from the other passages. When Jesus says, "I leave the world, and am no more in the world," they affirm this declaration can refer only to his visible presence. Thus, without authority from the word of God, they ascribe two kinds of bodily presence to Jesus Christ—the one visible, the other invisible; and represent him as saying, *I go away, but remain invisibly; I leave you, but my body shall be always with you.* Could any

* The English translation follows the Latin.—Parkhurst's exposition of the word δεχομαι is to receive or contain.

man, having the very body and soul of Christ in his mouth, in conscience say, that Jesus is not present, under pretence that he does not see him? Upon the same principle we might assert, that man has no soul, because it is invisible; or that such an one had left town, because he remains concealed in it. Further, Jesus himself warns us that a time will come when it will be said, "Lo! here is Christ; or, Lo! he is there," (Mark xiii. 21,) and forbids us to believe it. Again: "If he shall say unto you he is in the secret chambers, (or cupboards, as ταμειον also signifies,) believe it not." (Matth. xxiv. 26.) He evidently speaks of places in which some will say he is hid; and he uses the plural—ταμειοις—secret chambers, as if he were speaking of a Christ who was supposed to be in divers places at the same time. But Jesus clearly confutes all these subterfuges of our adversaries, when, for the purpose of comforting his disciples, who were sorrowful at his departure, he promised to send them the Comforter, who is the Holy Ghost. (John xiv. 16 and 26, and xv. 26.) According to the doctrine of the Roman Church, he should have said, *I go away, but I shall not cease to be in your mouths and stomachs, and shall be even much more with you than now.* He said nothing at all of this: but, to console them at his departure, he promised to send his Holy Spirit to them.

Paul says, (2 Cor. v. 8,) "We are willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord:" and (Phil. i. 23,) "having a desire to depart, and be with Christ." Had this Apostle lost his senses? For, according to the Papal doctrine, he should have said, "I am already with Christ,—I carry him in my hands,—I have him in my stomach." St. Augustine is very explicit upon this point, in his 50th Treatise on St. John, where he says, "In

respect to the majesty of the Lord,—in respect to his invisible and ineffable grace,—what he promised when he said, 'I will be with you always, even to the end of the world,' is accomplished. But, in reference to the flesh which the Word took, and to his being born of the Virgin Mary, &c., he said, 'ye have me not always.'" In his first Treatise on John i., "We can no more touch him with the hand, now that he is seated in heaven, but we can touch him by faith." This is addressed to the priests, who, in these times, vaunt of having Christ in their hands. In his 78th Treatise on John: "In respect to his manhood, Christ left the world; but, in respect to his God-head, he remained." In the 30th Treatise; "The body of Christ, which rose from the dead, must be in one place, but his truth is spread over all." In the Latin it is, *in uno loco esse oportet*, and not *in uno loco esse potest*, as in late corrupted editions. Gratian,* Ivo of Chartres,† Lombard,‡ Thomas,§ Gabriel Biel,‖ and the ancient editions of Augustine, have *oportet*. The sense also requires it. For it would offend common sense to say, that the body of Christ *may* be in one place: it might as well be said, that the sun *may* be in one place—which implies, that it might be in no place.

Cyril of Alexandria says, in his eleventh book on John iii.: "Though absent in the body, appearing for us before his Father, being seated at his right hand, he dwells in his saints by his Spirit." He supplies the want of his bodily presence by the gift of his Spirit, and not by keeping himself concealed under the accidents of bread.

---

* Gratian Dist. 2, de consec. Can. prim.—† Ivo 2 parte Decreti, c. 18.—‡ Lombard, lib. iv. Senten. Dist. 10, A.—§ Thomas 3 parte summae. q. 75, art. 2.—‖ Gabriel Biel, Lect. 39, in Can. Missae.

The Eutychian heretics held the same language as our adversaries, for they said that the body of Christ is present on earth as well as on heaven, by an invisible presence.—There was a Treatise written against them, in five books, some think by Vigil, others by Pope Gelasius, in the first of which we find the following: "The Son of God hath withdrawn himself, in respect to his humanity; but, with respect to his Divinity, he says, I will be with you even to the end of the world." In the fourth book: "When the flesh of Jesus Christ was on the earth, it was not in heaven; and, now that it is in heaven, it is not upon the earth."—It is plain that Vigil, by saying, when the flesh of Christ was upon the earth it was not in heaven, meant that it was not in heaven, either visibly or invisibly. In like manner, when he says, it is now no longer upon the earth, he means that it is neither there visibly nor invisibly. If he imagined that the flesh of the Lord is present invisibly, then he advocated the cause of the Eutychians, for that was their opinion. In short, the Apostle (Eph. iii. 17,) prays, "that Christ may dwell in our hearts by faith," and not that he may dwell in our stomachs with our food.

When we ask in what manner the body of Christ is present in the Sacrament, we are answered, that it is not present circumscriptively as wine contained in a tun, nor definitively as immaterial spirits, but that it is present sacramentally. It is indeed a very ridiculous answer. To say that Jesus Christ is present in the Sacrament sacramentally, is like saying that a man present in the temple is there temple-ly, or that he who is in a carriage is there carriage-ly. Moreover, by this answer they rank themselves on our side, for they themselves say that the word Sacrament signifies a "sacred sign;" therefore, to be present sacramentally means nothing more than to be present significatively, by figure and representation.

CHAPTER XIV.

Confession of our adversaries admitting that Transubstantiation is not founded in Scripture,—that the Ancient Church is consecrated by prayer, and not by these words, "This is my body."

The most learned Romanists do not found Transubstantiation upon these words, "This is my body," but on the authority of the Romish Church, which, they hold, cannot err.

Scotus, styled the Subtle Doctor,* affirms, that "there is no passage of Scripture which, without the definition of the Church, can constrain us to believe in transubstantiation." To this Bellarmine refers in the following terms:† "Scotus asserts, that there is no passage of Scripture so explicit as evidently to enforce belief in transubstantiation, without the declaration of the Church; and that is not altogether improbable. For though the Scripture texts that we have quoted seem to us so clear as to constrain every man not perverse, nevertheless one may of good right doubt if it be so, since some very acute and very learned men—such especially as Scotus was—have been of the contrary opinion." He also acknowledges Scotus to have declared, that transubstantiation was not an article of faith before the Council of Lateran, A.D. 1215.

On this account Vasquez,‡ after having related the opinion of Scotus, (with whom Durand is to be included,) maintaining that the truth of the consecrating words may be pre-

---

* Sent. 4, dist. 11, q. 3.—† De Euch. l. 3, c. 23. - ‡ In Thom. parte 3, disp. 180, c. 5.

served, though the substance of bread and wine remain in the Eucharist, blames Bellarmine, without naming him, for having said that this opinion of Scotus is probable, and accuses him of limping between the two sides. "We see (says he) certain professors of Theology in our time, who, limping somewhat from side to side, do not think the opinion of Scotus, regarding the words of consecration, improbable."

Amongst the learned and acute, must Cardinal Cajetan be classed, who says, in his Notes on Thomas,* "The other point, not explicitly explained in the Gospel, hath been received from the Church, namely, the conversion of bread into the body of Christ." Again: "Conversionem non explicitè habetur in Evangelio—conversion is not expressly stated in the Gospel." Cardinal D'Ailly:† "It is manifest that this opinion, which supposes that the substance of bread remains, is possible, and is neither repugnant to reason nor to the authority of the Bible; but is more easily understood, and more reasonable." On this account he also is reprehended by the Jesuit Vasquez.

Gabriel Biel, in the 40th Lesson on the Canon of the Mass: "In what manner the body of Christ is there, whether it be by the conversion of something into it, or whether without conversion, the body of Christ begins to exist with the bread, the substance and accidents of which remain, is not stated in the Canon of the Bible." He adds: "It is proved by the authority of the Church and the saints, for it cannot be proved by reason." Again he asks, in 41st Lesson, wherefore "the saints and the Church chose to say and determine that it ought to be understood in so difficult a sense, since the Scriptures might be ex-

---

* Cajetanus in 3 Thomæ, q. 75, art. 1.—† Pet. de Alliaca, in 4 sen. q. 6, art. 2.

plained, and their integrity preserved, in a way more easily understood?" To that he answers, "The Church hath thus determined:" meaning by Church, not the Syrian, nor Greek, nor Ethiopian, but the Roman Church only.

The Jesuit Salmeron, in expounding these words, This is my body, speaks thus:* "These words assuredly do not signify that any conversion is effected by the force of the words. Otherwise, whoever should say "This is my body," by shewing his own body, would intimate that something is converted into his own body;" and then he insists strongly that these words, "This is my body," are declarative or significative of that which exists, and not productive of what does not exist." Moreover, this Jesuit adopts the opinion of Pope Innocent III., who teaches† that Christ did not cause the conversion of bread by these words, *Hoc est corpus meum*, but by the Divine Power and benediction that preceded. For he supposes that the pronunciation of these words has a different virtue in the mouths of priests from what it had in the mouth of Christ. This opinion of Innocent III. was adopted by his successor Innocent IV., and by a multitude of others, mentioned by Salmeron in the above-named treatise.

It is probable these Popes and Doctors were induced to teach that Christ did not consecrate by the words "This is my body," but by the prayer and blessing previously offered; because this is accordant with the sentiments of the Fathers, and the belief of the Ancient Church. Justin Martyr calls what we receive in the Eucharist "food consecrated by the prayer of the Word," that is to say of Jesus Christ. Augustine,‡ speaking of that which is received in the Sacra-

---

* Tome ix. Tract 13.—† Myster of the Mass, b. 4, c. 6, 17.—‡ De Trinit. l. 3, c. 4.

ment, says, that "he took of the fruits of the earth; and consecrated by mystic prayer—*prece mystica consecratum.* Origen against Celsus:* "We eat loaves which, by prayer, is made a body, which is some holy thing." Irenaeus:† "The bread receiving the invocation of God is no more common bread but Eucharist." Basil, "on the Holy Spirit,"‡ calls the words of consecration, "Τα της επικλησεως ρημαται—words of invocation." Isodore, in the chapter on Offices, says, "The sacrifice is so called, as if one should say a sacred deed; because it is consecrated by mystic prayer, in *memory* of the sufferings the Lord endured for us."§ The Greek Churches, even to the present time, consecrate by prayer, as Bellarmine acknowledges.‖

It is now clear as day that the ancients did not believe that any conversion was produced by these words, This is my body.

CHAPTER XV.

Of the adoration of the Sacrament.—Opinion of the Romish Church.

The Roman Church having deified the Sacrament, is consequently obliged to worship it with that supreme adoration which is due to God only. By this means a wafer of bread is substituted for God, is called God, and is worshipped as God. They talk of elevating God in the

---

* Book 8.—† Book 4, c. 34.—‡ Book 1, c. 27.—§ Book 6 of Origenes.—‖ De Euch. b. 4. c. 12. See likewise the Canon Corpus in the second distinction of the Consecration.

Mass, and in Corpus Christi day, and of carrying him to the sick, which modes of speech are not in the Holy Scriptures, nor in the ancient Christian Church. The Council of Trent declares, in Sess. XIII., c. 5, that "there remains no doubt but that all the faithful in Christ ought to render that supreme worship which is due to the true God in veneration, to this most holy Sacrament. Now, by this word Sacrament, they understand the body of Christ under the sensible qualities of bread and wine, called accidents or species; for, by Sacrament, our opponents never understand Jesus Christ without these sensible qualities. This Council, therefore, ordains that the accidents or species of bread and wine be worshipped with supreme adoration. Their practice verifies what I say: for the people, in worshipping the consecrated wafer, do not direct their minds to different objects of worship, nor do they adore the body of Christ with one kind of worship, and the symbols of bread and wine with another, but they worship, with supreme adoration and exclusive devotion, the consecrated wafer before their eyes.

This is taught by Bellarmine in b. iv. c. 29 of the Eucharist, "We say that Christ (per se et proprie) is to be worshipped with supreme adoration, and that this adoration belongs also to the symbols of bread and wine, inasmuch as we conceive them to be one with Christ himself, whom they contain." And it is precisely in this way, he asserts, that the robes of Jesus Christ are worshipped with the same adoration as Jesus Christ; for, he adds, we do not undress him to worship him.

He lays down this maxim as infallible, and without exception: "He who worships any one, worships also all the things connected with him:" that is to say, he that worships images, worships also the cobwebs that are about

them; and he that worships the Pope, worships also his breeches and his shirt. He proposes, therefore, that the roundness, whiteness, length, breadth, and taste be worshipped, as God, with supreme adoration, because these accidents or qualities are one with Jesus Christ. Similar sentiments are expressed by the Jesuit Vasquez, on Adoration, b. ii. disp. 9, c. 1: "Supreme worship is rendered to the humanity of Christ, and to the Eucharist absolutely, though they be worshipped from being accidentally connected with the divinity." And to place it beyond doubt that the accidents of bread, *i. e.* the length, breadth, colour, and taste, are worshipped with the same adoration as Jesus Christ—he adds: "the accidents of bread and wine, on account that they do not exist independently of themselves, but by the body and blood of Christ, may very properly receive the same worship of adoration, together with the body and blood of Christ, even as his humanity and divinity are worshipped with the same sentiment and feeling of adoration." It is monstrous idolatry to render the same worship to the colour and roundness of bread as is rendered to God. The Egyptians seemed to have arrived at the utmost extreme of idolatry, when they worshipped cats, onions, and storks. But the idolatry of worshipping the accidents of bread far surpasses them. For the things they worshipped were substances and real existences, but accidents without a subject are unreal and imaginary, and have no existence. The folly of the Egyptians would have been much greater if, instead of worshipping the cat itself, they had worshipped its colour, length, and looks. Besides, they did not worship beasts and plants as the Supreme God, but as being, in some sort, emanations from the divinity. But the Romish Church worships the accidents of bread without bread, with that sovereign worship due to God only. Ob-

serve the doctrine of this Jesuit, who says, with the approbation of the censors prefixed to his book, that the accidents of bread exist in Jesus Christ in the same manner that the humanity exists in him, not by a subsistence of its own, but by subsisting in the divine nature. This, certainly, is to unite and combine the roundness and colour of bread in personal union with Jesus Christ.

And, accordingly, as errors mutually involve and adhere to each other, it is certain that the accidents of bread are not more closely conjoined with Christ than Christ is with the accidents. Consequently, by this imaginary union of Christ's body with the accidents of bread,—whatever happens to them must also be attributable to the body of Christ, which, it is said, is carried,—is elevated,—is led about; that it falls,—is stolen,—is eaten by mice,—is vomited,—and is devoured by beasts :—in like manner, on account of that same union, it must also be said, that the roundness and whiteness of the bread, are the Son of God,—were born of the Virgin,—are righteous and free from original sin. Assuredly, in all this the Romish Church is shewn to be idolatrous to the last degree. It is the sink of pollution, and abyss of deceit, into which Satan hath plunged men : God, in righteous displeasure, punishing the contempt thrown upon his word, which is become an unknown book among the people. For it is just that they who have lost piety, should also lose common-sense.

CHAPTER XVI.

The adoration of the Sacrament examined by the word of God.—The ancient Christians did not worship the Sacrament.

If Scripture had any authority with our opponents, this

controversy would soon be ended. Every action which relates to the service of God, and adoration in particular, ought to be performed in faith, not in dubiety and hesitation: "Let him ask in faith, nothing doubting." (James, c. i.) "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin," saith Paul. (Rom. xiv.) "Without faith it is impossible to please God." (Heb. c. xi.)—But it is impossible that the people of the Romish Church can worship the wafer in the Mass in faith, for it is not commanded in the word of God, and we know that "faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." (Rom. x.)

In general, we have the commandment saying, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." What is here said respects God, the Sovereign Creator and Governor of the world, and not a god made by words,—formed of bread,—liable to fall,—to be vomited,—and stolen. To worship this god is certainly to break the commandment of the Law, which says, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." In vain, is it answered, that Jesus Christ ought to be worshipped, since he is God. For, besides assuming what can never be proven, namely, that the bread is transubstantiated into the body of Christ, they themselves declare that they adore not only the body of Christ in the Sacrament, but also the roundness, colour, and taste of bread.

If it were incumbent on us to give religious worship to this Sacrament, some trace of the obligation would be found in the institution of the Holy Supper, and some commandment from the Lord, yet not the slightest appearance of either of these can be discovered. But we there see, that the Apostles sat at table, as is manifest from John xiii. 12, "after Jesus had taken his garments, and was set down again." During this repast, the disciple John leant his

head upon the bosom of our Lord. Paul, repeating the words of the institution, says, "I have received of the Lord that which I also delivered unto you." Since he does not mention the adoration of the Sacrament, it is certain he had not received it from the Lord, and did not believe that the Church was bound to worship the Sacrament.

Our adversaries usually attempt to evade the force of this argument, by saying, that the Apostles did not adore the consecrated host, because they had Jesus Christ always with them; and that, had they done it, it would have been necessary for them to be continually on their knees before him. I answer, that to mangle Jesus Christ with the teeth, to receive him into the mouth, and to offer him in propitiatory sacrifice, are actions which would have been new to the Apostles, and which necessarily required adoration. The offering of sacrifice always implies the adoration of him to whom it is offered. These very extraordinary and wonderful things, if they were true, would well deserve an extraordinary veneration. Above all, there was special need for them being recorded in the first institution, which was to serve as a rule and model, to which the church ought to conform.

Since our opponents suppose that Jesus Christ did eat himself in the Holy Supper, he might, for the same reason, have worshipped himself, and bent the knee before himself —a supposition sufficiently ludicrous, and suitable enough for transubstantiation. Our adversaries may here choose which side they will. Do they hold that Jesus Christ adored the consecrated wafer? But it would thence follow, according to their doctrine, that Jesus worshipped himself, and was more holy than himself, for it is certain that the worshipper and the person worshipped are two distinct persons. Do they maintain that Jesus did not worship the

consecrated wafer? But from this it would follow, that the Apostles, neither then nor afterwards, ever worshipped the consecrated wafer; for Jesus, by saying "Do this," commanded them to do as he had done. If the Lord had intended that the Apostles should adore the Sacrament, he would have elevated the host, as is done in every other sacrifice, to inculcate on the sacrificers and all present, the duty of worshipping it. This, however, Jesus did not do, for he offered nothing to his Father. He did not say, "Father, receive this offering." But to his disciples he said, "Take, eat." In the time of Tertullian and Cyprian, it was the custom of many Christians, men as well as women, to carry home the consecrated bread, which they received at Church, to fold it up in linen, and lock it in a box, an evident proof that they did not adore the Sacrament. For, would a woman have been allowed to take God in her hand, put him in her pocket, and keep him in her house?—Would Christians have reproached the Pagans with worshipping statues which could not move, nor rise when they fell, nor breathe—which are subject to decay, in which mice nestle, &c., if Pagans had had it in their power to throw the same reproach back upon them, and to say to them, that they adored a wafer, that could neither breathe, nor rise when it fell, nor open the eyes, nor stretch out the hand—which may be stolen, or eaten by mice, or overgrown with mould, &c.? *

Would Theodoret have ventured to say, that "it is extreme folly to worship what one eats," † if the Christians of that time had adored the Sacrament before eating it?—This error, more than all others, prevents unbelievers from

---

* See Arnobius, b. vi.; and Lactantius, b. ii. c. 2.—† 55th Quest. on Genesis.

embracing the Christian religion, as is stated by the late Arabian philosopher, Averroes, the Mahomeddan, from the twelfth book of whose Metaphysics, Salmeron makes the following quotation, "Quoniam Christiani Deum suum quem adorant manducant, sit anima mea cum Philosophis: since the Christians eat the God whom they worship, let my soul be with Philosophers."*

The most ancient mode of celebrating the Eucharist in the Christian Church, was that described in the end of Justin Martyr's Second Apology, in which there is no mention of adoration, nor yet is it to be found in the description extant in the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy of Denis the Areopagite.

There are some passages in the Fathers which say that Christ is worshipped in the Eucharist. This is not to the point; for the Father and the Holy Spirit ought to be worshipped there also. It is one thing to worship Christ in the celebration of the Sacrament, and another to worship the Sacrament itself. Nevertheless, the third Council of Carthage, in the 23d Canon, forbids addressing prayer to the Son in these words: "Let him that assists at the altar, address his prayer always to the Father." If the consecrated host had been worshipped, then there would have been no prohibition of praying to it. Among the ancients there are, indeed, some oratorical exclamations, in which the water of baptism and the bread and wine of the Eucharist are addressed, but that makes nothing for the adoration of the water or the bread. In Scripture there are in like manner addresses to the heavens, to the earth, to the sea, to the mountains; but is to be thence inferred that they ought to be worshipped?

---

* Salmeron, Tom. IX. Tract 18. — § Calvinus.

Respecting what Theodoret says, in his second Dialogue about the symbols being venerated, we shall speak hereafter. Προσκυνειται is the Greek word used, but it cannot be understood of supreme adoration, since signs and symbols are there spoken of, which cannot be religiously worshipped with supreme adoration without manifest idolatry. In the Greek copies of the African Code, Aurelius, bishop of Carthage, is frequently called Προσκυνητος. Abraham bowed down in reverence before the children of Heth; Jacob did the same before his brother Esau, and David before Jonathan. But Abraham, Jacob, and David did not esteem those to whom they did obesiance to be gods. Tertullian against Hermogenes says, c. 22, that he adored the plenitude of the Scriptures. Augustine writes, in the 164 Epistle, to Emeritus: "Baptismum Christi ubique veneramur—We venerate the baptism of Christ every where." Such modes of speech ought to be understood according to the subject.

CHAPTER XVII.

Of the intention of the Priest, without which the Romish Church believes that there is neither Consecration nor Transubstantiation.

The Church of Rome holds, that if the priest has not the intention of consecrating, and of doing that which the Church intends, there can be neither consecration nor transubstantiation.

This doctrine is thus laid down and defined by Pope Eugenius IV. in the Instruction to the Armenians, appended to the decrees of the Council of Florence. The

Council of Trent expressed itself upon this point in the following words, (Sess. viii. Canon 11): "If any one say that it is not required of ministers that their intentions be the same as those of the Church when they consecrate and dispense the Sacrament, let him be anathema." The Sacrament then is made void if the priest has not the intention of consecrating; and it is impossible that the people can ever be assured that consecration has been performed. For they do not know what was the thought and intention of the priest, and can only have a conjectural presumption of what it may have been. God alone knows the hearts of men, (2 Chron. vi. 30.) The adoration of the host, therefore, is a conjectural adoration offered purely upon chance, since no one can be assured of the priest's intention, without which the Sacrament is of no effect. Bellarmine frankly confesses, when writing on Justification, "That no one can be assured with the certainty of faith that he has received the true Sacrament, since the Sacrament is not made but by the intention of the minister; and no one can perceive the intention of another." Assuredly this Cardinal was right in saying, that no one can be certain. For there have been priests who were magicians, and there have been examples of priests convicted and punished for having consecrated in the name of the devil. There was one lately executed at Loudun, accused of being a magician, by the frantic Ursilines. There are also atheistical and profane priests, who make a mockery in their hearts of all they do in the church. I have known many priests who confessed, after their conversion to the true religion, that they had for many years chanted mass, contrary not only to their own conviction, but detested in their heart what they did; and who implored God to pardon them for having so long resisted their own conscience. There was, therefore, no con-

secration in all these masses. By this very doctrine it is evident that the priest does not know whether he be a priest; for he does not know what was the intention of him who ordained him: whence it follows, that all the masses he chants, and the absolutions he grants, remain doubtful; for no one knows whether they are valid. Perhaps the priest received the order of priesthood from a bishop who had the intention, but that the bishop had received his from another who had not the intention; and thus, the further back we go, the uncertainty increases, and may be multiplied indefinitely. This is admitted by Gabriel Biel, in the Abridgment of the Canon of the Mass: "No priest (says he) who celebrates the mass can positively know whether he be a priest; for he cannot know evidently whether he be baptized and legitimately ordained." The Old Testament Church, therefore, had a great advantage over the Christian Church; for in it, the salvation of its sons did not depend upon the intention of those who circumcised them, but upon the grace and covenant of God alone, which give support infinitely more stable than the intention of men.

Pope Adrian VI.,* following the Council of Constance, excuses the ignorant who worship the unconsecrated host, imagining it to be consecrated, by saying that they adore it, upon the supposition that it has been consecrated as it ought, repeating the words, "Adoro te si tu es Christus—I adore thee if thou art Christ;" which is the same as if one should say, "I do not know whether thou art Christ or not; but, be that as it may, I adore thee upon the supposition that thou art Christ. John Gerson, in the Treatise on the Examination of Doctrines, tome 1, brings forward an objection, drawn from Bonaventura, concerning the ado-

* Quod lib. sec. 10, supposito 2, fol. 70.

ration of the Eucharist, which is believed to be consecrated, although it be not so. In accordance with Bonaventura, he answers, "That this is an ordinary case, which has always the implied condition or supposition, that the priest hath acted according to the appointed rite of the Church; which condition need not be expressed in offering adoration. This adoration cannot, however, be counted sinful, because it is the custom of the faithful; of which we have an example in the worship of images." These Doctors teach the worshipping of the host, and the images of saints, under the supposition of consecration having been duly performed, and of the images being images of true saints. These things must be piously guessed at, and we must be satisfied with conjectures, and vindicate ourselves from guiltiness, by pleading the general custom of the faithful. But the faith of the believer is not founded upon conjecture. Faith does not worship God upon a mere presumption, not knowing whether he be God or not.

The power of this intention is so great, that the Jesuit Vasquez says, "it is a certain fact, that the power of consecrating has been committed to the priest, so that, should he be disposed to consecrate for a bad purpose, such as poisoning or enchantment, consecration would not fail to take effect."* By this means, Jesus Christ is put under the power of the magician, and may become the sport of the devil. Would God give to priests a power against God himself, which he will not take from them, when they employ it in the service of the devil? But, respecting this intention, men's consciences are amazingly perplexed, and even the Doctors themselves are embarrassed with it. For, if a priest has a huge household loaf before him, and has

* Vasq. in 3 parte Thomae. Tom. III. D. 174, N. 17.

the intention to consecrate only a part of it without dividing it, by what means may the body of Christ be discovered in the consecrated from the unconsecrated bread? If the priest has a dozen of wafers before him, and has the intention of consecrating only ten, how shall he distinguish them, if the consecrated happen to be mingled with the unconsecrated? How shall he distinguish his god from the wafers of common bread? Is it conceivable that Jesus Christ should not have left to Christians some means of knowing with certainty whether his body is, or is not, present under the symbols, thereby exposing them to the dangers of committing idolatry?

With regard to this adoration, it must be remarked, that the Council of Trent* decrees that the Sacrament is to be worshipped. Now, all the Doctors, unanimously with Augustine, define Sacrament to be a *Sacred Sign*. This Council, therefore, ordains the *Sign* to be worshipped. But if, by *Sacred Sign*, we must understand Jesus Christ himself, then he will be the sign and figure of himself, as is said by Bellarmine: "The same Christ was the figure of himself."†

On this point of adoration, God hath, by his just judgment, delivered our adversaries over to a reprobate mind. For when the host hath fallen into an unclean place, or is vomited through drunkenness, it is to be worshipped even thus polluted, for so are we taught by the Jesuit Vasquez:‡ "It is the common opinion of the Church, that the host plucked out of a vile place, or vomited by a beast, is to be worshipped as the true Sacrament, since there is no reason for saying that it ceases to be the body of Christ before it

---

* Sess. XIII. c. 5.—† De Euch. b. ii. c. 24.—‡ Vasquez, Tome iii. 3d part of Thomas, Disp. 195, c. 5.

be corrupted." The same author teaches, that if a beast has eaten consecrated wafers, and drunk of the consecrated cup, it will fatten and get drunk, and its stomach will be distended. It will, therefore, be drunk with accidents, and fattened on roundness and lines. In the beginning of the 4th chap. of this same dispute, this Jesuit says, "It may happen, that a beast which has eaten the sacramental symbols, may be equally as well fed as if it had eaten unconsecrated bread and wine. Indeed, it may even happen that the beast will get drunk, and its belly be stretched and swelled." In short, the beast may be like to burst with fat, in consequence of eating *God.*

To escape from this reproach, and to protect Jesus from so unseemly liabilities, some Doctors of the Romish Church, and particularly Bonaventura, have thought that as soon as the consecrated host was devoured by a beast, or was thrown into mud, or some impurer place, the body of Christ withdrew, and the substance of bread returned, by a second transubstantiation, not less wonderful than the first. But Pope Gregory XI.* condemns this opinion in the Directory to the Inquisitors, (p. 2, q. 20,) and herein he accords in opinion with Thomas, Scotus, and the Jesuits, who generally hold, that the body of Christ may really be taken by a beast, and carried off by mice.

CHAPTER XVIII.

That our opponents embarrass themselves in this matter with absurdities and insolvable contradictions.

It is difficult to believe a man who does not believe him-

* Vasq. in 3d part of Thomas, Disp. 195, c. 5.

self, who contradicts himself, and accumulates so many absurdities, as seem to indicate a fear of being believed. That two contradictory things cannot both be true, is a maxim to which there can be no exception. Our opponents themselves confess that it surpasses even the omnipotence of God to make a thing to be and not to be at the same time; for example, that Cæsar be truly man but not a rational being, that the same figure be both a square and a circle. Our opponents in transgressing this rule, confound things that are distinct, affirm that things incompatible are the same, and in regard to this subject, accumulate a thousand absurdities; some of which we shall now particularise:—

I. They assert that the priest, by pronouncing five words, makes the body of Christ in the mass, which, nevertheless, existed before the priest made it; as if one were to say, that whilst Philip was at Paris somebody made him at Rome. To make what already exists, and to unmake a thing that has no existence, is equally absurd.

II. If a person be in this chamber, not having been in it the day before, he must necessarily have come from some other place, or have been born in it. But it is said that Jesus Christ was not in the mass before consecration, but is there after it, and, nevertheless, did not come there. He must, therefore, have been born there, or have been formed anew, although he previously existed.

III. They affirm that the *species* of bread and wine, such is their mode of expression, contain the body of Jesus Christ; and, nevertheless, that it is not contained in them, for that is in heaven. It is a ridiculous contradiction to affirm that a body may be external to that which contains it; for it thence follows, that that which contains it, does not contain it.

IV. They affirm that the body of Christ, in full size and

stature, is contained in the smallest crumb of the host, and in the smallest drop of the cup; so that if one dip the point of a pin in the consecrated cup, the drop which remained suspended upon the point of the pin would contain the entire body of Christ. Whence it follows, that what is contained is greater than that by which it is contained; as if it might be said that the crown-piece is greater than the purse, and the earth greater than the heaven which encloses it.

V. They ascribe to the body of Christ length without extension—that is to say, length without length, since its entire length is under a single point.

VI. They affirm that the body of Christ is in this place, but not locally; as if it might be said, that it is white, but has no whiteness. They affirm that the body of Christ is present, not corporally but spiritually. But to pretend that a body is present spiritually, is as absurd as to pretend that a spirit is present bodily.

VII. They pretend that the body of Christ hath both length and breadth in the Sacrament, and yet that it occupies no space. But this is impossible, seeing that length and breadth are space.

VIII. They assert that the body of Christ is not present in the Sacrament circumscriptively—that is to say, not bounded nor enclosed in any place. Nevertheless, what they deny of the whole body, they admit concerning each part of it. For they cannot deny that the brain of the Lord's body is enclosed and circumscribed in the head, and that his heart is enclosed and limited in the pericardium, and the lungs in the poitrine, since they acknowledge his body to be a true human body.

IX. They assert that the consecrated host is the body of Christ, that the priest breaks this host, and, nevertheless, that the body of Christ is not broken. They assert that

the blood of Christ is shed in the Mass, and yet that it does not move nor issue out of the veins. Shedding implies motion; how then can the blood of Christ be shed without motion ?

X. They assert that the priest drinks the body and spirit of Christ under the symbol of wine. By this means they make the body of Christ liquid; for how can they assert that the priest drinks the body of the Lord under the symbol of wine, if it has not lost its solidity under that symbol ?

XI. They assert that Jesus Christ ate himself, and swallowed his own body;—whence it follows, that, at the same moment, the mouth was in his head, and his head in his mouth, and the whole enclosed in a part, instead of the parts being comprehended in the whole. Would not the man be esteemed mad, who should say, that the scabbard is in the blade of the sword, and the purse in the crown-piece ? All this is maintained without being able to shew in what respect it benefits us that Jesus ate himself. The absurdity becomes much greater from this, that the Jesus Christ eating himself was infirm and passible,—speaking, moving, and sitting; but, that the Jesus Christ eaten by himself, was incapable of suffering, free from infirmity,—neither speaking, nor moving, nor sitting, nor reclining, nor standing. By this means, the passible Christ devoured the impassible; and Jesus ate himself, not such as he was, but such as he was not.

XII. It is true, that contradictory things may be predicated of the same subject at different times, parts or respects, that is to say, in comparing this thing to things diverse.—For example, a man may be young and old at different times—white in one part of the body and black in another. He may be great and little, rich and poor, in different rela-

tions, that is to say, when compared with different persons; great in comparison with a dwarf, little in comparison with a giant—rich in comparison with a beggar, and poor in comparison with a Seneca or Lucullus. But here they attribute contradictory things to Jesus at the same time—not in different parts, not by comparing himself with another, but with himself. They pretend that, at the same time, he is the containing and contained,—speaking and moving in instituting the Eucharist, but neither speaking nor moving in the mouths of the apostles,—having length without length,—extension and no space.

XIII. They assert, that as God can cause one identical human body to exist entire in divers separate places at the same instant, and thus be separate and distant from itself, so that it may be said, it is one and not one; so God can cause two bodies to occupy only one and the same place, by penetration of dimensions, as they are wont to jabber in the schools; that is to say, that God can cause a vessel, containing only one pint, to contain two—nay three—nay ten—nay a thousand—nay a million—and so on to infinity, without any enlargement: so that this pint vessel, without being larger, shall contain the whole sea, while the waters thereof suffer no diminution. By this doctrine, in truth, the whole world, without decreasing in size, might be contained in a grain of corn.

XIV. Philosophy, by a thousand reasons, proves it to be impossible that there can be any *vacuum* in nature; and our adversaries, with great propriety, teach this doctrine in their schools. By vacuum, we understand an extent of space, not filled with any substance—a place that is full of nothing. Nevertheless, the Romish Church, by transubstantiation, makes a vacuum in the consecrated cup. They say the cup is full, but with what they cannot tell. It is

not full of wine, for they hold that the wine is no more.— It is not filled with the body of Christ, for they hold that the body of Christ, in the Eucharist, occupies no space.— As to the accidents, they do not constitute a body. Therefore it is utterly unknown with what body the cup is filled.

XV. When Jesus broke the bread to his disciples, it is difficult to conceive but that some crumbs might fall upon the table, and that some fragments of the consecrated bread might be left. According to the doctrine of the Romish Church, the body of Christ would be entire in each of these crumbs and fragments. When Jesus rose from the table, he did sweat great drops of blood; we ask then, if that body, in any of the crumbs, did likewise sweat drops of blood?— When Jesus was nailed to the cross, was the body in the crumbs or fragments likewise crucified under the species of bread? For, if he was not crucified under the species of bread, then there were two Christs, the one crucified and the other not. Or, if the body of Jesus was crucified under the species, we must necessarily conclude, that the cross and the soldiers who crucified him, were likewise under the species: for crucifixion without a cross is inconceivable, and a manifest contradiction.

XVI. The body, also, which was under the consecrated remnants, must have been either alive or dead, whilst the body of the Lord was in the sepulchre. If alive, then Christ had two bodies, one of which was dead whilst the other was living. Or, if the body of Christ, which was in the crumbs, suffered death under that form, then one body of Christ suffered death, but not on the cross, and was not even touched by the soldiers.

XVII. If any of the disciples had celebrated the Sacrament, and offered a living sacrifice, whilst the body of the Lord remained dead, his offering could not be that body

which was in the sepulchre. Or if, by the pronunciation of the consecrating words, he had converted the bread into a dead body, he could not have offered a sacrifice, for a dead body is not an acceptable victim. For a solution of these difficulties, we must refer to the Papal oracle, or to some decision of the Sorbonne.

XVIII. From this doctrine it also follows, that when in processions on the festival of Corpus Christi, two consecrated hosts meet and pass by the side of each other, Jesus Christ meets himself, and walks before himself. It is to be presumed, that these hosts know one another, and offer to each other mutual salutation; and that, if the one should fall, the other, which hath not fallen, will regard the fallen one with compassion.

XIX. Now we come to the strangest case of all, and the one with which the Romish Doctors chiefly embarrass themselves, and wofully jumble their brains. There was a time when it was disputed in the Romish Church whether God could cause the one same body to be circumscriptively in two or more different places. For example, whether God could make Philip to be at Paris and in Rome, contained in and bounded by two different distant places, at the same time. But now, by general consent, this is held to be possible. Amongst those who have written in these times, I know none but Vasquez who holds the contrary opinion. This doctrine being admitted, it will follow, that if Philip be in water at Rome and in fire at Paris, he is both wet and burned at the same time. If he have an arm cut off in Paris, he will have only one at Paris, but two at Rome. If he be killed at Paris, he would be dead at Paris, and alive at Rome; and, perhaps, arriving at Paris from Rome, he might find himself dead, not having known it before, and might attend his own funeral. Perhaps the

Philip of Paris might go to Rome to see himself, and not find himself at his arrival, he being absent from Rome. If they should both set out to meet on the road, the same man would go to meet himself; and having met, how would their noses jumble unto one? How could the same man turn his back on himself? If Philip feast at Paris, and fasts at Rome, he will be full and hungry, fat and lean, at the same time. If Philip meet himself by the way, and Philip embrace Philip, it is evident they must be two men, for conjunction can take place only between things that are different.

XX. If the body of the same man may be in a thousand different places at the same time, it may also be in a hundred thousand, and if in a hundred thousand, or in million, and so on, always increasing, then the body of a single man may at last fill the whole world. Plurality of places, in fact, becomes ubiquity. The only difference between the Roman Church and the Ubiquitarians, is, that the latter maintain that the body of Christ is every where, while the former say that it may be every where. Assuredly, then, the Romish Church has no right to contend against the Ubiquitarians, in what she herself believes to be possible.

XXI. A point in Mathematics hath neither quantity, magnitude, nor divisibility. To put a point, therefore, into two different distant places, is to divide a point and separate it from itself. This is what our adversaries do in putting the same body into two different places. For example, if, at same time, Philip may both be at Rome and at Paris, the point in the pupil of the eye is the same at Rome as at Paris; it is, notwithstanding, divided from itself, is separated, and far from itself.

XXII. And as the Angelic Spirits can only be definitively in one place, those, therefore, who put the body of

the Lord in several places at the same time, make it more spiritual than the spirits, and separate it from itself.

XXIII. There is much impiety mingled with this doctrine. For, it is maintained, that after the priest hath eaten the host, the body of Christ remains in his stomach till the species be destroyed by digestion. The body of the Lord, therefore, does not remain after the species are destroyed, and yet it hath not gone away, for the gentlemen of the papacy say that it cannot move locally. Whence it follows, by absolute necessity, that Christ's body, which was in the priest's stomach, is annihilated. Our opponents cannot tell where it hath gone, nor what becomes of it.

CHAPTER XIX.

Of accidents without subjects.—Passages of the Fathers.

The accidents without a subject, said to be in the consecrated host, is another heap of absurdities, and ridiculous contradictions. For what greater incongruity is there than this, namely, that "Accidentia non accidunt;"* as if one should say, Albentia non albent,—that persons speaking are not speaking; and forging of qualities that qualify nothing; colour and nothing coloured; length and nothing long; roundness and nothing round: which is as if one should pretend a sight without an eye; a sickness when there is no person sick; lameness and no leg; an eclipse of the moon

---

* Arist. Lib. vi. Metaph. cap. 1. Loquens de accidentibus.—Ουδεν γαρ αυτων εστιν, ουτε κατ'αυτου πεφυκος ουτε χωριζεσθαι πεφυκος της ουσιας.

when there is no moon. Thus saith Pope Innocent III., in the Mysteries of the Mass:* "Here there is colour and taste, quantity and quality, though there be nothing savoury,—nothing coloured, nothing having quantity or quality." God, in short, hath so created substances and accidents, that a created substance cannot be without accidents, neither can accidents be without a substance. Between these there subsists such a connexion, that to separate them is like saying, there is a father who never had a child, or there is a child who had no father.

This error precipitates our opponents into many others. For, if the host becomes dirty from having fallen into the mire, then here are accidents supporting a substance; and instead of the substance being the subject of the accidents, the accidents are, on the contrary, the subject of the substance.

It cannot be denied that ice is a substance. When, therefore, the consecrated cup is frozen, it is pretended that only the accidents freeze. Behold, then, here are accidents become a substance by another kind of transubstantiation not less marvellous than the first, by which, nevertheless, our redemption is nothing benefited; unless it merely be, that they wish our Lord's body should be frozen.

If the host grows mouldy, then lines, whiteness, length, and roundness, have moulded. If the consecrated cup be heated so that it smoke, then here are accidents which produce a substance. If (as Thomas† and the Jesuit Saurez‡ admit) worms breed in the consecrated host, then accidents have engendered a substance, and inanimate accidents have

---

* Lib. iv. c. 11.—† Thomas, 3 part. qu. 77, art. 3 and 5.—† Saurez, in 3 Thomae, Disp. 57, s. 3.—‖ Platina, in Victore III. et Clemente V. Naucler. Gener. 4, Aventinus, lib. vii. p. 598.

produced an animated substance; but no one can tell what benefit accrues to believers.

The histories our adversaries have written, shew that Pope Victor III. was poisoned in the cup of the Mass, and that the Emperor Henry VII. was served in the same way when the host was administered to him. The same thing happened to Henry, Archbishop of York, in the year 1154, as is related by Matthew of Paris. At that time, it was said with horror, *God is poisoned.* It was probably to avoid this inconvenience that trial is made in the mass before the Pope partakes of it: his domestics do the same before he partakes of his ordinary food. Moreover, though the accidents only are poisoned, and the absurdity of poisoning length, breadth, and colour, where there is nothing long, broad, nor coloured, is most glaring, still much dishonour is done to Jesus Christ in that his presence does not banish the poison, and that his body is a vehicle to the poison; so that that body which was given for the salvation of the soul, may be employed for the death and destruction of the body.

The Fathers formally oppose this error. Gregory Nyssen, in his work of six days: "The figure is not without a body." Augustine, in his 57th epistle to Dardanus: "Take away bodies from the qualities of bodies, and they exist no more; and, indeed, they necessarily cannot be." A little afterwards: "If the mass of the body be entirely taken away, its qualities no longer remain." He likewise says, in the second book of the Soliloquies, "Who can concede what you demand of me,—namely, that what is in the subject may remain when the subject is abolished?"

In short, among all the Fathers, there is not one who says that accidents remain without a subject in the Eucharist. Had that been their belief, they would, when they

say that an accident is never without its subject, have mentioned the Eucharist as an exception.

Moreover, Augustine declares openly, that there is no miracle wrought in the Eucharist: "The bread made (says he) for this purpose, is eaten when the Sacrament is received; but because these things are known to men,—because they are made by men,—they may be honoured as religious, but cannot be admired as miraculous."* There are three books concerning the *marvellous things of Scripture*, in the third tome of this good Doctor's works, but there is no mention made in them either of transubstantiation or of the Eucharist.

Those who talk to us here of miracles, do not understand what a miracle is. A miracle is a sensible and visible effect of the power of God, above the course of nature, or contrary to it, that men might discern his agency. But there is nothing miraculous seen in the Mass. Nobody, without falsifying, can boast of having seen transubstantiation effected. We do not deny that God can do all things if he will. But, we say that it is impossible that he can will such things as these, for he is not a liar, and will not contradict himself; nor will he accommodate nor subject his omnipotence to men, who employ it in ridiculous absurdities, and in inventing chimeras.

CHAPTER XX.

Answers to certain examples of Scripture, which our adversaries bring to prove, that the body of Christ has been in two different places at the same time.

To give a colouring to this error, our opponents assert,

* De Trinitate, lib. iii. c. 10.

that as God has sometimes caused two bodies to occupy one and the same place, he may, in like manner, cause the same body to be in several different places at the same time; and thereupon they allege, as an example, that Jesus entered through the shut doors, (John xx. 19,) and, consequently, that he penetrated the wood of the doors. But they falsify Scripture. John does not say that Jesus entered through the shut doors, but that he entered, *the doors being shut*. Perhaps he entered some other way than by the door; perhaps the wood of the door or the stones of the wall gave way before him, the creature yielding and obeying the Creator, according to the saying of Jerome: "God entered at the shut door, the creature having given way before the Creator." In saying that he entered in at the shut door, he understood that the door yielded to him, or that he opened it in entering. In like manner, when I say a troubled stream passes through clear water, I mean that it troubles it in passing. But it is always best to abide by Holy Scripture. For the same purpose, they allege that the body of Jesus Christ, coming out of the sepulchre, passed through the stone laid at the door thereof, without its being removed. (Matth. xxviii. 2.) But this passage is also falsely cited. For Matthew, in that very place, says quite the contrary: "And, behold, (says he) there was a great earthquake,—for the Angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and rolled back the stone from the door of the sepulchre." Mark says the same—chap. xvi. 4. Leo I., bishop of Rome, admits it in his 95th Epistle to Leo Augustus, saying: "The flesh of the Lord rose on the third day, the stone having been rolled away from the tomb."

To what purpose is it alleged that Jesus walked upon the waters? How does that fact prove that his body might be in two different places at the same time? He that walks

upon the waters is not, therefore, distant from himself. If Jesus Christ, by his divine power, strengthened the waters under his feet, or sustained his body upon them, that it should not sink, he did not thereby put his body into several different places, nor change the nature of his body.—If in my hand I bear a stone above the water, that does not change the nature of the stone, nor take its weight from it.

To prove that the body of the Lord hath sometimes been in two different places at the same time, reference is made to Acts xxiii. 11, where it is said, "The night following, the Lord—επιστας—stood by Paul." From this it is inferred, that the body of Christ was in heaven, notwithstanding his standing by Paul on earth. In speaking thus, they assume, without proof, that the "Lord" mentioned here is Jesus Christ only, and not simply God, without distinction of persons. Even restraining this word "Lord" to the person of Jesus Christ, still there is nothing in the passage constraining us to understand it of his bodily presence, rather than of his divine nature and power. Could not the Son of God speak to Paul, and make himself understood by his divine power, without bodily and local approach? The Greek word—επιστας—here used, signifies not merely to present one's self, but also to come to him unexpectedly, to bring aid, and to make his favour to be felt, as may be seen Acts xii. 7, Luke ii. 9, Acts xxiii. 27, in each of which it signifies to come unexpectedly. But the Romish Church does not believe that Christ comes to, or upon, the Sacrament, but that he is made in it.

CHAPTER XXI.

Concerning the dignity of the Priests.—That our adversaries debase the utility and efficacy of Masses, and render them unavailing for the remission of sins.—And concerning the sale of Masses.

The Romish Doctors speak of the Eucharist as the greatest mystery of the Christian religion, and extol the power of the priests, in making Jesus Christ with words, in such inflated terms, that they call them gods and creators of their Creator, having a power above the blessed Virgin Mary, and above all the angels, who cannot make Christ, because he is already made.

This is what Gabriel Biel teaches in the 14th Lesson on the Canon of the Mass: "The angels, citizens of heaven, dare not aspire to the authority of the priesthood." And again: "Passing by the companies of angels, let us come to the queen of heaven, and mistress of the world. Although, in the plenitude of grace, she far surpasses all creatures, nevertheless, she yields to the hierarchs, (it is thus he styles the priests,) in performing the mystery committed to them." In this Lesson also, he says, that "Christ is incarnated between the hands of the priests, as in the womb of the Virgin—and the priests can create their Creator, and have power over the body of Jesus Christ."

In the second book of the Royal Priesthood, (c. ii.) Peter de Besse writes thus: "Saint Peter adds, priests are all kings, in token of which they wear a crown." And in chap. iii.: "The priesthood and the divinity have I know not what in common, and have nearly the same grandeur, seeing they have the same power." (Matth. xvi. and xviii.)

Further: "Since that the priesthood proceeds by the side of the Godhead, and that the priests are all gods, it far surpasses royalty, and the priests are much greater than kings." In the same place, he calls the priesthood "Masters of kings, surpassing royalty as much in dignity as the soul surpasses the body." This comparison is taken from Baronius. He adds, "Things incredible, but nevertheless true, priests have a power so great, and an excellence so noble, that heaven depends upon them." The same author, in comparing the priests with Joshua, at whose prayer the sun stood still, says, "He caused the sun to stand still; but they cause him who is in heaven to abide upon the middle of the altar; the creature was obedient to him, the Creator to them: the sun to him—God to them, whenever, and as often, as they pronounce the sacred words." In short, he concludes, that "the priest holds the same place on earth which God holds in heaven." To the book containing these things is prefixed the approbation of the Faculty of Theology of Paris.

It is proper to know, that England, having been a long time without a bishop subject to the Pope, the English Papists lately complained that they had no person to confer orders, or administer consecration, without which the Canons declare that no one can be wholly Christian. At their desire, Urban, the reigning Pontiff, willing to satisfy them, sent a titulary bishop, styled bishop of Calcedon. But the Jesuits, having it in their power to domineer amongst the English Papists, would not receive him, declaring, that confirmation was not necessary, and that baptismal unction might supply the want of Episcopal Chrism; and that the Church may go on without a bishop. Against these Jesuits the Sorbonne of Paris threw out its censures, denouncing their doctrine as heretical and scandalous.

The Jesuits treated these censures with ridicule, in a reply full of sarcasm, entitled the Sponge. To refute this Sponge, the Faculty of the Sorbonne employed the pen of Peter Aurelius, a Sorbonnist. In his book, printed at Paris, for Charles Morell, A.D. 1634, (p. 175,) we find these words: "The bishops have the power of producing Christ, that is to say, God himself, &c. This power is, in some manner, infinite and equivalent, not only to the fecundity of the Virgin Mother of God, inasmuch as the Virgin Priests procreate upon the altar this same God, whom the Virgin first procreated in her most holy womb: but this power emulates the eternal operations by which the Divine Persons are produced in the eternal generation, by which the Father produced, by his divine mouth, this same Word, whom the priests produce by their sacred mouth." From this it is obvious, that the power of the priests greatly surpasses that of the angels. In page 177, he says, that "the priests perfect the redemption of the human race;" and in page 187, "the power of the priests has great resemblance to the divine power,—they have the power over the real body of Jesus Christ, and over his mystical body, which is the Church." To this book the Sorbonne prefixed its approbation.

Long before this time, Pope Urban II. assembled a Council at Rome,* A.D. 1097, against the Emperor Henry IV., in which he fulminated against all earthly princes, who should claim the investiture of benefices, alleging that "it is an abominable thing that the hands which create God their Creator, by their sign, should be subjected to the ignominy of serving as chamberlains to hands which are night and day polluted and defiled with dishonourable occupa-

---

* Simeon Dunelmensis, lib. 2 Chron. Vignier Hist. Eccles. p. 310.

tion." Reason requires, if these things be true, that so great a power should not be conferred upon priests, unless there be some great necessity, and some great advantage to accrue to the Christian Church, and unless the many marvels our opponents accumulate in the Eucharist were to be highly beneficial to believers. Nevertheless, when the benefits resulting from transubstantiation and the sacrifice of the Mass are examined, they are found reduced almost to nothing, and the Mass is rendered almost wholly useless.

This is shewn more clearly than day, by a comparison with baptism. There is no transubstantiation wrought in baptism. The water is not turned into blood after the words, " I baptise thee in the name of the Father," &c., but preserves its own nature. Yet baptism, according to the Romish Church, is a thousand times more profitable, and more excellent in its nature, than the Eucharist. For she holds that baptism is absolutely necessary to salvation; yet that many are saved, who die without ever partaking of the Eucharist, appears from the case of John the Baptist, of the malefactor crucified with our Lord, and of the many non-communicant faithful, and especially from those called Catechumens in the ancient Christian Church. Secondly, our opponents assert, that, by baptism, original sin is not only pardoned, but that it is even entirely taken away; so that those who are baptised have no more original sin, nor any thing that can be called sin;—but the Romish Church does not believe that the Eucharist blots out guilt, or roots out vicious habits, in such a way as to warrant its being said, that those who partake of the Eucharist are without avarice or pride, coveting or lascivious lust.

The chief thing which our adversaries insist on is, that all the guilt and all the punishment, temporal and eternal, of sins venial and mortal, committed before baptism, is, by

baptism, remitted and blotted out. But they say, that the Eucharist serves only against venial sins, which they account so trivial, that it is not necessary to have even contrition or repentance for them. The Jesuit Vasquez* says, "Rude and uncultivated men need not to know the particular virtue of this sacrament for the remission of venial sins, for that remission is not necessary to salvation." It is taught in the Catechism of the Council of Trent, in the chapter on the Sacrament of the Eucharist, that "it is not to be doubted that such trifling sins as are usually called venial, are, by the Eucharist, remitted and pardoned;" which remission, Vasquez tells us, is not necessary. Bellarmine states one of Luther's errors to be, the having said "that the first effect of this sacrament is the remission of mortal sins." Towards the end of the same chapter it is added, "the whole question is reduced to this article,—whether the sacrament of the Eucharist confers the remission of mortal sins on the man whose conscience is charged therewith, or (for it is quite the same) whether it be not required for worthily communicating that a man have his conscience free from the charge of any mortal sin—for all Catholics teach that the Eucharist does not remit such sins to the man whose conscience is charged therewith—and, therefore, it is required that those be first purged." And, in the beginning of chapter 18: "It is not taught in this chapter that the Eucharist was instituted for the remission of sins, but solely for the preservation of spiritual life." And even though the Doctors were not so express upon this subject, still it is evident, from the practice of the Romish Church, that the Eucharist and the Mass in that Church are of no avail for the remission of sin. For whoever intends to perform his

* Vasquez, tom. iii. in 3 parte Thomae, Disp. 179, c. 3, n. 26.

Easter devotions, first confesses, and then receives the absolution and remission of all his sins from the priest.—Whence it follows, that when he communicates in the host shortly after, he has nothing to pardon; and that the Eucharist is a plaster to a healed wound, and a remedy for an evil no longer existing. Of how very little efficacy the sacrifice of the mass in the Romish Church is, likewise appears by the chanting a thousand masses to draw one soul out of purgatory; yet, after so many masses, it still remains doubtful whether the soul hath gone to paradise, or whether its state be still uncertain.

The body of Christ is sacrificed in private masses in the corner of the church, for the consolation of the sick and for the cure of a horse, yet it often happens that the man and the horse die; so that the priest has created his Creator, and sacrificed the body of Christ, in vain. Hence arises causes of very great doubt, whether masses be of any avail for the release of souls from purgatory. For if they cannot procure so small a benefit, what assurance have we that they can procure a much greater? These private masses must always be paid for by those at whose desire they are said; but since no soul has ever returned from the other world to thank the persons who caused them to be said, who can be sure that their money procured it any solace? The priest does not whisper in his *memento* the names of persons for whom there has been nothing paid: nor is there any thing said about private masses for the soul of a beggar. For these reasons, Gabriel Biel, in the 25th Lesson on the Canon of the Mass, cautions testators, who make some bequest to the Church for the relief of their souls, to select faithful executors, lest their souls be cheated out of the suffrages of the Church for want of payment;—

that is to say, masses are never said unless when paid in advance.

And since our opponents hold with us that Jesus Christ, now seated at the right hand of God, makes intercession for all the faithful, it thence follows, that he also intercedes for the souls in purgatory. If they are let out of this fire through the intercession of Jesus, masses are useless; but if they are not let out, who will believe that a mass, or an indulgence from the Pope, will procure what the intercession of Jesus Christ failed to obtain?

It is an established maxim among the Doctors, that a mass said for three or four persons, who pay for it conjunctly,* does not benefit them so much as if each had caused a mass to be said for himself. By this way, they wish to triple or quadruple their gain. There is a rule of great equity laid down by Emanuel Sa, in his Aphorisms on the Word Mass. "If a priest has received a sum of money to chant a certain number of masses, he may hire others who will do them cheaper, and keep the rest of the money to himself."

It is strange that the priests, who are believed to have the power of making God with words, and of carrying Christ daily in boxes and in their stomachs, are, nevertheless, held in such contempt; and that the country priests are the dregs and disgrace of the people; and that whilst a deacon cardinal, who has no power to make Christ, equals kings in magnificence, the pitiful priest tipples in a tavern, and gains his livelihood by chanting private masses for any that will employ him. Who can, with so much propriety as he that offers Jesus Christ in a private mass for fourpence or fivepence, say, like Judas, "What will you give

* Eman. Sa, Aphorism. Verbo Missae.

me and I will deliver him to you?" Some men vaunt of giving God who cannot give salvation. Our adversaries themselves confess, that there are some priests damned; from which it follows, that a man who hath oftentimes carried God, is himself carried away by the devil.

CHAPTER XXII.

That the Roman religion is novel, and was invented for the benefit of the Pope and the Clergy.

It is not with a very good grace that our opponents, after having disfigured and entirely changed the Christian religion, venture to accuse us of novelty. For, in truth, the Romish religion is a garment patched up with new pieces,—a heap of doctrines, invented and amassed from age to age, forged upon the anvil of avarice and ambition. We are ready to submit to all sorts of punishment, if, in five hundred years after Christ, and we could descend lower, it be proved that there was a single man who had a religion in the least resembling the religion of the Romish Church, such as it is at the present time. Can a single Church be found in antiquity, which deprived the people of the cup in communion? Did the Ancient Church forbid the people to read the Holy Scriptures? * Did she believe in purgatory? Did any one then speak of Romish indulgences, and of the treasure of the Church, in which the Pope stows the superabundant satisfactions and penal works of saints

* It is supposed by many Protestants, that this most daring prohibition has been rescinded, but whoever consults the Rev. Edward Craig's Second Friendly Address to Roman Catholics, will find it clearly proven, that Roman Catholics are still precluded from perusing the Scriptures.—R. S.

and monks, and distributes them to others by his indulgences? Were images of God and the Trinity, in stone or in painting, then made? Were the images of saints worshipped? Were penitents seen whipping themselves in public, not only for their own sins, but also for the sins of others? Did the bishops of Asia, Egypt, or Africa, swear fidelity to the bishop of Rome, or accept letters of investiture from him? Was the public service performed in a language which the people did not understand? Was the bishop of Rome then called God? Did he claim worship? Did he canonize saints? Did he pluck souls out of purgatory? Did he grant pardons for two or three thousand years? Did he depose kings, or vaunt of having the power to give and take away kingdoms? Had he the power to dispense with oaths and vows, and of dissolving marriages legitimately contracted, under pretence of the monastic profession? Did any then talk of chaplets, rosaries, blessed grains, Agnus Dei, &c.? I say the same of the titles, Queen of Heaven and Mistress of the World, given to the Virgin Mary; and of the various charges given to the saints, to one over a country, to another over a sickness, to another over a disease, to another over this or that trade. The power which the priests arrogate to themselves of pardoning sins in their quality of judges is likewise new, and is part of the iniquity of the later ages. In like manner, there is not a vestige to be found throughout antiquity, of private Masses, where there are no communicants and no hearers, said at the instance of those who pay for them.—The book, entitled the Tax of the Apostolic Chancery, shews at what price absolutions may be obtained for murder, parricide, incest, perjury. So many groats or ducats for having killed a father, and so many for maternal

incest.* A Romish Jesuit, named Sylvester Petra Saneta, lately wrote a book against me, from which I learn one thing I did not know before. He mentions, in chap. xiii. that during the time of Advent and Lent, the Pope does not permit any one in Rome to pass a whole night in a brothel, which would be a violation of the sanctity of Lent. On this account, during these days of devotion, it is permitted only to pass the day and part of the night with bawds. Are such laws to be found in the Ancient Church? In short, this religion is wholly of a late date—it is a confused collection of doctrines and laws, which were never heard of in ancient times, and were invented expressly for the profit and extension of the Papal Empire,—for the establishment of a monarchy, which had no existence in the first ages of the Church,—and for retaining the people in ignorance, lest the mystery of iniquity should be discovered.—The Pope and the Clergy find indulgences, private masses and prayers for trespasses, to be exceedingly lucrative. By means of auricular confession, the priests obtain knowledge of family secrets, and hold the conscience in bondage. They do not grant absolutions for nothing. The supererogatory works and satisfactions of monks replenish the spiritual treasury, of which the Pope keeps the key, and distributes them to the people by his indulgences, so lucrative to himself and clergy. By granting absolutions, the priests make themselves judges of souls and judges in the cause of God. By reserving the communion cup to themselves and to kings, they make themselves the companions of kings, and assume a rank above the people. By the celibacy of bishops and other clergy, the Pope prevents the dissipation of the eccle-

* Cap. de absolutionibus. Absolutio pro eo qui interfecit patrem, matrem, gros. 7. Absolutio pro eo qui falsifacavit literas Apostolicas, grossos. 15.

siastical treasures, and their being applied to the support and enriching of their children.

By painting God the Father in the apparel of the Pope, the opinion is instilled into the people that God is like the Pope, and has a vast intimacy with him, since he has borrowed his robes. By the canonization of saints the Pope causes his valets to be worshipped by the people, and gives them the title of saints in recompense for their services.— By the sacrament of penance, the Pope and the priests usurp the power of imposing upon sinners pecuniary fines and corporal punishments, even to the flogging of kings. By performing the service in the Latin language, the people are retained in ignorance; by having it imposed upon them, they are taught that they are within the pale of the papal empire. The Roman language is bestowed on them for the purpose of subduing them to the Roman religion.— The power of the Pope to dethrone kings, makes him king of kings, and erects for him an empire, where he is elevated above all the grandeur of the world. The images, called the books of the ignorant, accustom men to neglect the Scriptures, which are utterly unknown in those countries where the inquisition reigns. By transubstantiation, the priests can make Jesus Christ, and keep him under their controul. The Pope, by ordaining holy days during the week, regulates the civil police, causes the shops to be shut, and the sittings of the Courts of Justice and King's Council to be suspended. When merchants shut their shops, the clergy open theirs; and then it is that the people obtain pardons, visit relics, and sprinkle themselves with holy water, which is always at hand. The Pope, by the distinction of meats and fast-days, regulates the markets and stomachs, kitchens and tables, of kings and people. The more numerous the prohibitions are, the more frequently are applications made to

Pope and Prelates for dispensations. The Pope decreed marriage to be a Sacrament, that he might take the cognizance of it away from judges and magistrates: for Sacraments are under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Church.

The Pope, by dispensations for the degrees of consanguinity within which marriages are forbidden in the word of God, obliges the children of Princes, (for such dispensations are granted to none but the great,) born of such marriages, to defend his authority, that their own legitimacy may be maintained. From Annats and Archiepiscopal cloaks, the Pope derives incredible gain. For a mantle of this kind he draws sixty thousand ducats. The Pope, by the power he has assumed of being able to change the commandments of God, and of absolving from oaths and vows made to God, exalts himself above God. For he who can absolve men from fidelity and obedience to God, must be greater than God.

The invocation of saints, the worship of relics, and the miracles said to have been wrought by them, serve to build many churches and monasteries, which powerfully support the domination of the Pope; in short, all the crafty devices in the world has been employed to this end. Never was an empire raised with so much artifice. The doctrine which teaches us that Jesus Christ, by his death, delivers us from the guilt and punishment of sins committed before baptism, but that we must bear the punishment of the sins committed after baptism, either in this life or in purgatory, takes from the merits of Christ to make room for vile traffic, and to give credit to indulgences, and masses for the dead: every thing, in short, is turned to profit—even death itself is tributary to the Romish clergy.

CHAPTER XXIII.

Answer to the Question addressed to us,—Where was your Religion before Calvin?

"Shew us where your religion was before Calvin?" is the utterly unjust and deceptive demand made upon us on every occasion. To prevent us from examining the Romish religion by Scripture, its advocates amuse us with human histories; for that question is not one of theology, but of history, in which God hath nowhere commanded us to be learned that we may be saved. But he hath commanded us to be instructed in his word. In the day of judgment God will not ask us if we believed, according as they did who lived in the age before Calvin, but he will judge us according to the Gospel and according to the Law, (Rom. ii. 12—16.) If to be saved, it were necessary to be skilled in the history of the ages before Calvin, scarcely one of a thousand among the Christians, from the apostles downward to Calvin, could be saved. Yet, if it be a question of histories, we must certainly begin with the most ancient, and, before speaking of the time preceding Calvin, it is incumbent on our adversaries to shew where *their* religion was in the times of the apostles. Being utterly nonplused and unable to shew their religion in the writings of the apostles, they send us away to the unwritten word, which depends upon the authority of the Pope, whom they constitute judge in his own cause, and make the Romish Church sovereign judge of her own duty. The chief point is, that the Christian Church ought to be governed by the laws and practice of the Church in the apostolic age, and not according to the example of what she had become before

Calvin's time. Because Calvin exhorted us to believe in the holy Scripture, he is talked of as if he were the inventor of our religion. Calvin does not give us laws. We do not lay for ourselves any foundation on his authority,—we do not say of him, as the Romish Church does of the Pope, that he cannot err. We do not even call ourselves Calvinists, as our opponents style themselves Papists, and glory in the title. Cardinal Baronius saith, in his Martyrology, 16th October, "You cannot adorn a man with a greater degree of glory than by calling him Papist." By his account, therefore, the title Papist is as good as the name Christian.

This question is specially absurd in reference to us. For when it is asked, Where was your religion before Calvin? it is taken for granted that the Orthodox Church must be visible in all ages. Scripture doth not say so; but it forewarns us of great revolts, and of false doctors, who shall teach men to refrain from marriage and from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving, (1 Tim. iv. 3;) it foretold that all the world should wonder, and go after the beast, (Rev. xiii. 3;) and that when Christ shall come, he shall scarcely find faith in the world, (Luke xviii. 8.) It speaks to us of the Man of Sin, the son of perdition, (Thess. ii.) who sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God, making signs and lying wonders;—and of the great whore, clothed in scarlet, seated in the city on seven hills, reigning over kings, seducing and making them drunk with the wine of her fornications, and is herself drunken with the blood of the saints, (Rev. xvii.) It tells us that wings are given to the Church to flee away into the desert, and to remain hid for a time; and it tells us that broad is the way along which the multitude go to destruction. This suggests to us another consideration. It is

this: if a thief, who had stolen another's purse, should thereafter come to him and ask, "Where is thy purse?" he would add mockery to theft. Thus the Pope, who persecuted the Church of the Lord to the utmost during many ages, and endeavoured to effect its utter destruction, adds mockery to his violence by asking, "Where was your Church then?" He ought rather to tell us where he had put it, and to what he had reduced it.

Moreover, though we are not bound to answer so absurd and unjust a question, proposed to us by persons who have departed from ancient Christianity,—who have embraced a novel religion, and who assert that the Pope may add new articles of faith to the Creed,—nevertheless, we say, that the Pope, for four or five centuries, persecuted the faithful unto fire and blood; of whom there were a number in France, in the Netherlands, in England, Germany, Bohemia, and Hungary, to whom our adversaries give odious names; calling them Albigenses, Bulgrians, Picards, &c.; imputing unto them impious and abominable doctrines which were very far from their belief. Dominic, the founder of the order of the Jacobins, and Count Montfort, massacred more than two hundred thousand of these men in Languedoc in a few years, in the pontificate of Innocent III. We have their Confession of Faith, which is in accordance with ours, written in their own language. A remnant of them continued in Bohemia, Hungary, Moravia; in the valleys Angrogne, Lucerne, Peruse, St. Martin, Pragela, in the Alps; and at Lormarin, Merindoles, Cabieres, in Provence, whose churches were united to ours, when God raised up the standard of the gospel in France and the neighbouring countries. The sudden change that took place in the time of Luther, shewed that Europe was filled with people

acquainted with the truth, and panting for the reformation which the Pope always promised, but never performed.

But to descend to a more particular consideration of the age that preceded Calvin. Aeneas Sylvius, who became Pope in 1458, was the inveterate enemy of the faithful, who, in his time, abounded in Hungary, Bohemia, and the neighbouring countries, and was a firebrand in kindling the flame of war, by stirring up Popes and Emperors to persecution. On this account his testimony is the more worthy credit in this matter. In his hundred and thirtieth epistle he describes his journey to Tabor, a town in Bohemia, and the religion of the inhabitants: "Their sect (says he) is pestilential and abominable, and worthy of the utmost punishment; they are adverse to the primacy of the Romish Church, and the possession of property by the clergy; they throw down the images of Christ and the saints; they deny the fire of purgatory; they hold that the prayers of the saints, who reign with Christ, profit men nothing; they keep no festivals but Sabbath and Easter; they contemn fast days and canonical hours; they administer the Eucharist in both the kinds of bread and wine, even to little children and to madmen. In consecrating the Sacrament, they repeat only the Lord's prayer and the words of consecration; they do not use change of vestments nor any ornament. Some are even so insane as to maintain, that the true body of Christ is not in the Sacrament on the altar, but that there is merely a representation of it there, being errant followers of the nonconverted Berenger. Amongst the Sacraments of the Church they receive Baptism, the Eucharist, Marriage, and Order. But they have little regard for Penance, and none at all for Confirmation and Extreme Unction. They are very hostile to the religions of the monks, affirming them to be diabolical inventions.

They use only simple water in baptism,—they have no holy water. They do not consecrate their burial grounds,—they bury their dead in the fields among the beasts as they well deserve," &c. He adds, "that the emperor, instead of extirminating them, had bestowed on them liberty and security." But he ought rather to have informed us that the emperor Sigismund having made war upon them, was discomfited in several battles. This is the reason wherefore he left them in peace. Sylvius hath thrust many calumnies into this discourse, such as administering the Sacrament to children and madmen, and the burying their dead among beasts,—absurdities that never existed; but as to the rest, we see therein almost the whole of our religion.

At that time, Hungary was full of faithful men, holding the same belief. In the year 1508, they presented their Confession of Faith, which is in accord with ours, to King Uladislaus, defending themselves against an Augustine monk, who had accused them to the king of many errors, the principal of which were, that they did not obey the Pope,—did not invoke the saints,—denied purgatory,—communicated under both kinds,—and rejected transubstantiation. Observe how they speak upon this point: "This Augustine monk writes, that the bread and wine, in their natural substance, are transmuted into the body and blood of Christ, and are changed into Christ, God and man, so that nothing of the substance of bread and wine remains, but that the bare accidents are manifestly sustained by miracle. This Confession of Faith hath no foundation in the words of the Lord Jesus Christ, who hath not said a single word about the conversion of the substance."* And again:

---

* This Confession is to be found in Fasciculo rerum expetendarium.

" By this it is obvious, that the primitive Church had this belief, and confessed it, and did not err, and did not bow in adoration to this Sacrament: for, in primitive times, the Sacrament was received sitting—nothing was preserved, nothing carried away," &c.

At the same period, (1520,) Calvin being still very young, the Faithful in Provence presented their Confession of Faith, which is in accordance with ours, to the Parliament of Aix. Observe how they speak on the point of the Sacrament: " We are not involved in any errors or heresies condemned in the Ancient Church, and we hold the instructions approved by the true faith; and in regard to the Sacraments, in particular, we hold them in honour, and believe that they are testimonies and signs, by which our consciences are assured and confirmed in the grace of God. For this reason, we believe that baptism is the sign by which the purgation we obtain through the blood of Christ is confirmed in such a manner, that it is the true washing of regeneration and renovation. The Supper of the Lord Jesus Christ is the sign under which the true communion of the body and blood of the Lord is given to us." These poor Churches were the remnants of the horrible persecutions carried on against them by kings and princes, at the instigation of the Popes, during the space of three or four hundred years. These simple Christians were defamed with horrible heresies, were accused of being Manicheans, and enemies of marriage, in the same way as we are accused of being enemies of the saints and of the Holy Virgin, and of believing that good works are not necessary to salvation, and of making God the author of sin.

There happened, a few years before this, under the reign of Louis XII., who was called the father of his people, a memorable event, which is related by Charles Du Moulin,

the celebrated lawyer, in the book of the French Monarchy. He says, "that some cardinals instigated this good king to exterminate the inhabitants of Cabrieres and Merindoles in Provence, saying, that they were sorcerers, heretics, incestuous, and formerly condemned by the Apostolic See. But the king answered, that he would condemn no one to death without knowing the cause; and, for this purpose, he sent M. Adam Fumee, Master of Requests, and John Parin, his Jacobin Confessor, into that district, to inform themselves upon the spot concerning their religion. This they did, and reported to the king, 'that they found no images, nor vestige of any ornaments of Masses or Papal ceremonies, among the people,—that they found nothing relating to magical arts and whoredoms, or other crimes, which had been imputed to them.' Upon hearing this, the king cried out with an oath, that these men were better Christians than either he or his people, and confirmed them in their privileges and immunities." This happened in 1512, when Calvin was scarcely yet born.

Pope Julius II. waged war against this king, but he defeated both the Papal and Imperial armies near Ravenna. At Pisa he assembled a Council against the Pope. He caused a new coin to be struck with this inscription, *Perdam Babylonis Nomen*, as is recorded in the first book of President de Thou's history.

But these poor Churches suffered barbarous persecutions and massacres under Francis I., the successor of Louis XII. Nevertheless, they still subsist in several parts, and their religion is briefly noticed by President de Thou in the sixth book of his history. These Vaudois, for so he calls them, affirm that "the Romish Church had departed from the faith in Jesus Christ, and had become Babylon, the great whore spoken of in Revelation,—that neither the

Pope nor his prelates ought to be obeyed,—that the monastic life was a pollution of the Church, and a hellish thing, —that the fire of purgatory, the Mass, the dedication of Churches, the worship of the saints, and prayers for the dead, are the inventions of Satan." He then adds: "To these, the principal and true heads of their doctrine, some have falsely added others concerning marriage, the resurrection, the state of the dead, and concerning meats."

The same author mentions, (b. 27,) the Churches in the valleys of the Alps, descended, as he says, from the ancient Vaudois, which hold religious opinions entirely conformed to ours. He informs us that in 1560, they presented their Confession of Faith to the persons sent to them by the Duke of Savoy, their prince, in which they declare that they hold the ancient doctrine contained in the Old and New Testament, and in the Apostles' Creed, and held by the four first Universal Councils, and they hold the Ten Commandments of the Law as the rule of moral conduct. They taught men to live chastely, soberly, and righteously, and to obey princes and magistrates. They, moreover, rejected the sacrifice of the Mass, the Sacrament of Penance, auricular confession, human traditions, prayers for the dead, but clung with stedfastness to the Holy Scriptures. They say they have not received them from Calvin, but from Jesus Christ and his apostles, for that the strait passages and precipices of the Alps had secured them from the violence and persecution of the Pope and his ministers.

Even at the present time, the Church of Ethiopia, which comprehends seventeen extensive provinces, agrees with us in fundamental points of faith, although she practises some trifling superstitions. She neither believes in purgatory nor in transubstantiation,—she neither elevates nor adores the host. She is not subject to the Pope,—she neither

knows his indulgences, nor private masses. She celebrates divine service in the Ethiopian language; she administers the communion to the people both in bread and wine; she does not worship the images of the saints; she has only one table or altar in the church; she hath monks, but they marry, and gain their sustenance labouring with their hands. The males are not baptised till they are forty, and the females till they are sixty days old, a sure sign that they do not believe that baptism with water is necessary to salvation. These things may be seen in the history of Francis Alvarez, a Portuguese monk, who lived six years in the court of the great Neguz, emperor of Ethiopia.

They calumniate the Ethiopian churches who accuse them of being Eutychian. It is very true that they are subject to the patriarch of Alexandria, who is a Eutychian This, however, is not a subjection in doctrine, but consists simply in the said patriarch having the right of nominating the Abuna, or premier prelate, of the Ethiopians when the See is vacant.

The Greek Church, more ancient than the Roman, and the source whence the latter derived her Christianity, does not recognise the Pope,—rejects his laws,—knows nothing of his indulgences; neither believes in purgatory nor transubstantiation; celebrates divine service in the Greek language; has married priests; has no private masses; and approaches much nearer to our religion than to the Roman.

I mention these examples not to found any thing upon them, or claim them as authorities. For we found only on the word of God contained in the holy Scripture, to which the Pope boasts he is not subject, nor even recognises it as judge.

In conclusion, we abide fast by the proposition before stated, namely, that our adversaries must shew us where

their religion was in the times of the apostle, ere we condescend to shew them where ours was before Calvin.

CHAPTER XXIV.

That our opponents reject the Fathers, and speak of them with contempt.

Being hard pressed by the Scriptures, our opponents are wont to have recourse to the Fathers, whom yet they do not acknowledge as judges,—confess that they have taught numerous errors, and speak of them with great dis-esteem.

The Jesuit Dennis Petau, in his notes upon Epiphanius, writes, p. 244: "The most holy Fathers, and especially Chrysostom, in his Homilies, have disseminated many things which, if we would adjust them to the rule of exact truth, would be found destitute of sound sense." In the Annals of Cardinal Baronius, it is declared, (A.D. 34, sec. 213,) that "the Catholic Church does not always follow the most holy Fathers in the interpretation of Scripture;" and in sec. 185, "Jerome hath erred through a slip of memory." In A.D. 31, sec. 24, he blames Augustine for not having rightly understood these words of our Lord, "Thou art Peter," &c.; and in A.D. 60, sec. 20, he is wroth against Theodoret for rejecting the worship of angels, founded on a passage in Paul's Epistle to the Colossians, c. ii. 18. "By this (says he) we may see that Theodoret (let it not offend him) hath not fully understood the meaning of Paul;" and in A.D. 369, sec. 24, "Hilary had also his defects."

Alfonsus de Castro says, in the first book of Heresies,

that "the opinions of the Fathers are often contradictory to one another."

Melchior Canus, in the Common Places, b. 7, c. 3: "Seeing that there are none of the saints except those who wrote the canonical books, but have spoken by a human spirit, and have erred in what hath afterwards been acknowledged to belong to faith, it is evident there can be no certain faith on such authority." He thereupon produces, by way of specimen, the errors of several Fathers; and goes the length of saying, that "they gave birth to monsters, contrary to the order of nature."

Sixtus Senensis, in the preface to the fifth book of his Bibliotheca: "These ancient masters have sometimes strayed from the proposed scheme of truth." "Further: "In the books of the holy Doctors, whose authority is high in the Church, false and heretical things are sometimes found." In this he follows Anselm's Commentary on 2 Corinthians.

The Jesuit Maldonat, on John chap. vi., blames Augustine for not having rightly comprehended what Jesus Christ meant when he called himself "the bread," and says, "I am persuaded that Augustine would have been of another opinion if he had lived in our time." And again: "I approve of this interpretation far more than Augustine's."

Cardinal Cajetan, in the beginning of his Commentary on Genesis: "Let no one reprobate a new interpretation of Scripture, under the pretence that it is discordant with the ancient Doctors; for God hath not fastened the exposition of Scripture to the sentiments of the ancient doctors."

Andradius, in the second book of the Defence of the Tridentine Faith: "That I may not mention Augustine, Athanasius, Basil, both the Cyrils, Chrysostom, and Epiphanius, to whose opinions we do not always adhere."

The Jesuit Pererius, on Genesis, b. 8, disp. 1 : " I am ashamed to mention what I must assert here, against very good writers, they say so many things, not only false, but shameful and absurd." Now, the Fathers to whom he alludes, are Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Clemens, Alexandrinus, Cyprian, Ambrose, Lactantius, Eusebius, Sulpicius Severus.

The Jesuit Salmeron, in the eighth Prolegomenon: " Each Father expounds the same passage of Scripture differently from the others: indeed, even the same Father expounds it in diverse ways." And he adduces, in the third Prolegomenon, many examples of Fathers contradicting themselves. The same author acknowledges, in the 51st disp. on the Epistle to the Romans, that he has the Fathers generally against him on the point of the conception of the Virgin Mary, of whom he rids himself thus: " Against this multitude, which is objected to us, we answer with the word of God, Thou shalt not follow a multitude to do evil, neither shalt thou speak in a cause to decline after many to wrest judgment." (Exod. xxiii. 2.)

Cornelius Musse, bishop of Bitonto, on Rom. xiv. : " I would rather believe, I confess it frankly, in one sovereign Pontiff, than in a thousand Augustines, Jeromes, and Gregories."

I should never have done, were I to produce all the passages, in which our opponents rudely reprove the Fathers, and accuse them of ignorance and error. In some things they are right, in others they are wrong. Chrysostom * often accuses the Virgin Mary of ambition, rashness, and importunity. Justin Martyr† and Clemens Alexandrinus‡

---

* Chrys. Hom. 45 on Matth. et 21 on Johan.—† Justin's Dial. against Tryphon.—‡ Clemens Strom. vi.

say, that God created the sun and the moon, that the Gentiles might worship them, lest they should be without religion. Justin, Irenaeus,* Lactantius, Ambrose, Tertullian, and many others, were Millenarians, who held that Christ's kingdom will be established on the earth for a thousand years, abounding in banquets and carnal delights. Ambrose† teaches, that baptism, administered in the name of the Holy Spirit, without the name of the Father or Son, is valid. Augustine condemns children dying unbaptized to eternal flames. Cyprian teaches the rebaptizing of heretics, and assembled a Council, in which the doctrine of the Romish Church was condemned. Hilary‡ taught that Jesus Christ suffered no pain in death, and that the Virgin Mary must be purged by the fire of the last judgment. Jerome§ calls marriage an ignominy, the end of which is death, and says the married are vessels appointed to dishonour; he also taught that bishops and priests are equal by divine right.‖ Bellarmine declares that "this opinion is erroneous, and must be refuted in its proper place."¶ Gregory of Nyssa teaches, in his first oration on the resurrection of the I ord, that Christ's body was already dead, and his soul in hell, when he instituted the Eucharist. For this he is thus censured by the Jesuit Salmeron: "There are, in these words of Gregory, many things that the Church does not approve."** Clemens Alexandrinus teaches, that Pagans were saved by philosophy. Tertullian makes God corporeal. Clement I, bishop of Rome, wishes, in his Decretal Epistle, goods and women to be common. In tome ix. of the Annals of Baronius, there is an Epistle of Pope

---

* Iren. lib. v.—† Ambr. de Sp. San. lib. i. c. 2.—‡ Hilar. de Trin. lib. x. et in Ps. 68, 119, 138.—§ Jerome in Jovian. lib. i. and ii.—‖ Jer. Epist. ad Titum. c. ii.—¶ De Pontiff, lib. i. c. 8.—** Salm. tom. xi. Tract. 7. De modo resurr. Christi.

Gregory II., in which he declares that it is not lawful to paint God the Father; but Baronius notes in the margin that the Church hath now ordained it otherwise.

In the Council of Chalcedon, six hundred and thirty bishops decreed that the bishop of Constantinople is in every respect equal to the bishop of Rome. The Council of Milevitain, at which Augustine attended, and drew up the Canons, forbids the appealing beyond sea—that is to say, from Africa to Rome—under pain of anathema.

The sixth Council of Carthage confirmed the same prohibition, and wrote long letters to Celestine, bishop of Rome, in which he is warned to beware of henceforth receiving appeals from Africa,—of sending his legates to them any more,—of employing fictitious Canons for advancing his authority,—and of introducing worldly pride into the Church. The Romish Church condemns the Fathers in all these things, and in many others, and quite disregards their authority. Hence it is manifestly vain and useless in our adversaries to quote the Fathers to us in certain questions, since they themselves reject them, and subject them to the authority of the Pope and the Romish Church.

CHAPTER XXV.

Concerning the corruption and falsification of the writings of the Fathers, and the difficulty of understanding them.

In quoting from the Fathers in our controversies, we labour under this disadvantage, that the Fathers have come to us only through the hands of our adversaries. For all the impressions that have been made of them, have been

from manuscripts found in monasteries, written by monks, who had fine sport in altering and erasing, and in patching old titles to new books of their own composition. It is a hard condition that one of the litigant parties should not have it in his power to make use of any documents but such as are furnished by his opponent, who hath inserted in them whatever clauses he chose. But by the providence of God, it hath happened that the greater part of the forgeries are so gross, that we have scarcely any trouble in detecting the falsehood of many passages and spurious pieces, which are so numerous, that were they taken away, the Fathers would be diminished one-third. Those of our opponents who are conversant with the writings of the Fathers, acknowledge it, and concur with us in condemning it.—Read the latter part of the fourth book of Sixtus Senensis, and Cardinal Bellarmine's book of Ecclesiastical Writers, where he hath given a catalogue of the works of the Fathers. You will be astonished to see there the number of books which he calls doubtful, or manifestly supposititious. This brings suspicion on the remaining parts, and on other works, the forgery of which is not so easily detected. We have been aided in discovering these forgeries by the catalogue of the works of the ancients, written by Photius, patriarch of Constantinople, about A.D. 878, and inserted in his Bibliotheca; and by Gennadius, priest of Marseilles, who wrote a book concerning illustrious men, about A.D. 492; also by the diversity of style,—by passages of the Fathers, quoted quite differently by Ivo, Gratian, Burchard, Lombard, Thomas, and others, from what they are in the editions printed last century; and also by other opposing passages from the same Father, so that he is often found opposed to himself.

It was the ninth century that forged, under the name of

one Isidore Mercator, the Decretals of the ancient bishops of Rome, which were lying inventions, intended to establish the Papal monarchy, that forcibly reared itself during that age. In like manner the eleventh century, in which Berenger, archdeacon of Angers, vigorously combated the error of the real presence and transubstantiation, is the age in which many writings were forged in favour of this error, and various clauses thrust into the books of the ancients. —Of this false alloy is the book on the Lord's Supper ascribed to Cyprian, which all the learned of the Romish Church acknowledge not to be his. The same is the case with the Mystagogical Catechisms of Cyril of Jerusalem. The Catechisms of Gregory of Nyssa are indeed his, but are horribly corrupted, and are pervaded by errors not approved by the Roman Church. Mention is made in them of the heretic Severus, who lived a hundred and fifty years after Gregory of Nyssa.

We have treated of these forgeries, and many others, in the book against Perron. Were the supposititious books that bear the names of Cyprian, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, and Athanasius, taken away from the works of these Fathers, their writings would be reduced more than one-third. However, after so many detected forgeries, we might very justly call upon our adversaries, when they object to us any passage from a Father, to prove that it has not been added or vitiated by some forger, like as so many others have been. If a document produced in law contain a single forgery, the entire document, as is every way just, loses all its force, and is rejected.

There is another difficulty that imposes a deception on those who are little skilled in antiquities, which is, that the words used in former times have now changed their signification. We find the words Pope, sacrifice, oblation, puri-

fying fire, indulgence, station,* species, monk, penance, in the writings of the Fathers, but in quite a different sense from that in which they are now used.

Notwithstanding these difficulties and disadvantages of which our adversaries endeavour to avail themselves. we do not hesitate to enter willingly into the contest. For whatever forgeries may have been foisted into the works of the ancients, there still remain so many express and explicit passages against transubstantiation, as would form a large volume. We produced more than five hundred in the book upon the Novelty of Popery; and Messrs. Faucheur and Aubertin have lately laboured on this subject with the utmost diligence, and with profound learning. We shall here content ourselves with producing a few passages, that may serve as a specimen. It is, however, with this protestation, that we do not quote the Fathers for the support of our cause, which is sufficiently supported and established by the word of God. God does not beg the testimony of men; his word is as powerful by itself as when accompanied by human testimony. To propose to defend it by the authority of men liable to err, is like proposing to enlighten the sun with a candle. But we quote the Fathers in defence of their honour, because, contrary to their own intention, they are made the advocates of a bad cause, and to accommodate ourselves to the disease of this perverse age, in which the authority of the holy Scriptures is slighted, and human testimony put into hostile array against the word of God.

---

* Station—Visiting certain churches and chapels appointed for gaining indulgences. – GATTEL.

CHAPTER XXVI.

Passages of the Fathers adverse to Transubstantiation, and to the oral manducation of Christ's body.

Tertullian, when contending against the Marcionites, who denied that Jesus had a true human body, said, b. iv. c. xl. "Jesus Christ having taken bread and distributed it to his disciples, made it his body, saying, 'This is my body;' that is to say, *the figure* of my body: but there could be no figure if there were not a true body." His reason is, that we do not represent a thing which does not exist by any figure. And again, b. iii. c. xix.: "Jesus Christ called the bread his body, that you may thereby understand that he appointed *bread* to be the *figure* of his body."

Concerning what the faithful receive by the mouth in the Eucharist, Origen, on Matth. xv., says, "If all which enters in at the mouth goes into the stomach, and is thence evacuated in the secret place, then the food, also, which is sanctified by the word of God and by prayer, since it is material, goes into the stomach, and is sent thence into the draught-house." It is afterwards added, that "that may be said in reference to the typical and figurative body of Jesus Christ." Cardinal Perron, writing to M. Du Plessis, loudly exclaims against this passage of Origen, calling him the origin of all errors; and cries out, "Christians, shut your ears"—as if they had read with their ears.

Perron asserts, that Origen was condemned by Theophilus, patriarch of Alexandria, for the passage just recited, but that is utterly false and groundless.

Theodoret, speaking of these words, "This is my body,"

says, in his first dialogue, entitled the Unchangeable, "the Lord honoured the visible symbols with the appellation of his body and blood,—not having changed their nature, but having added grace to nature." He had previously said, "the Lord called the sign his body." In the second dialogue, entitled "Without Confusion," "The divine mysteries are signs of the true body," he introduces a Eutychian heretic shortly after, maintaining transubstantiation, to whom he answers in these words: "Thou art taken in the net thou hast framed; for the mystic signs do not change their own nature after consecration, but remain in their former *substance, figure*, and *form*."* In the same dialogue it is demanded: "Tell me, then, what do the mystic signs offered unto God *represent?*" It is answered, "The body and blood of the Lord."

In the books on the Sacrament attributed to Ambrose, we have the following clause of the public formulary, used in celebrating the Eucharist: "Grant that this oblation, which is a FIGURE of the body of Christ, may be placed to our account, as reasonable and acceptable."† This cannot be understood of unconsecrated bread, for it is not an acceptable oblation for our sins. This clause still remains in the Mass, but the word *figure* is now deleted. In the Demonstration of Eusebius, b. 1, c. 8: "We have been instructed to celebrate, at the table, the memory of this sacrifice, by the signs of his body and blood, according to the laws of the New Testament." And in b. 8, after having said "that Jesus Christ gave the signs or symbols of his dispensation to the disciples," he adds, "commanding them to celebrate the image or figure of his own body."

---

* Μενει γαρ επι της προτερας ουσιας.—† Lib. iv. c 5.

Ephraim, patriarch of Antioch, saith: "The body of Jesus Christ, which the faithful receive, does not lose its sensible substance, nor is it separated from intelligible grace. In like manner, baptism being wholly spiritual and one, preserves the property of its sensible substance—namely, of water—and ceases not to be what it was." This passage is one of great force, for bread is here called the body of Christ, but it is not admitted that any change of substance has taken place; nay, it is asserted, that there is no more change of substance in the Eucharist than there is in baptism, in which the water always remains water.

Gregory of Nazianzen speaks of the participation of the Eucharist, in the second oration on the Passover, as follows: "We shall indeed participate in the passover in a figure, yet more clearly than in the ancient passover, for, if I may so say, the ancient passover was an obscurer figure of a figure." The same Father, in his oration laudatory of his sister Gorgonia, commends her devotion in that when she received the Sacrament in her hand, she carried a part of it home. "If (said he,) her hand had treasured up any portion of the symbols or antitypes of the body and blood of the Lord, she mingled it with her tears."

"Consider diligently (said Ephrem, deacon of Edessa,*) how the Lord having taken bread into his hands, blessed it, and brake it for a figure of his immaculate body, and blessed the cup for a figure of his precious blood, and gave it to his disciples."

In the eleventh homily of the imperfect work upon Matthew, attributed to Chrysostom, referring to those who used the sacred vessels, such as plates and cups, for profane purposes, it is thus written: "If it be so dangerous to transfer

---

* Ephrem. ad eos qui Filii Dei naturam scrutari volunt.

to private uses the sacred vessels, which do not contain the true body of Christ, but merely the mystery of his body, how much more dangerous is it to profane the vessels of our bodies, which the Lord hath prepared for his own habitation? Observe, he does not say that the body of Christ *was* not in these vessels, but that it *is* not in them, and that they contain the *mystery* of his body, lest it should be thought that he spoke merely of the vessels in the temple of Solomon.

Jerome says, in the second book against Jovinian, "Our Lord did not offer water but wine to typify his blood."—And in the Commentary on 1 Cor. ii., attributed to Jerome: "Christ hath left us a last token of remembrance, like a man going on a journey, who should leave some pledge to him whom he loves."

Augustine, in the 12th chap. against Adimantus: "The Lord did not hesitate to say, 'This is my body,' when he gave the sign of his body." And in the 23d Epistle to Boniface, after having adduced several examples of figurative modes of speech—as when on Good Friday we say, "To-day Christ died," and when on Easter Sunday we say, "To-day Christ is risen," because these days are destined to celebrate the memory of the passion and resurrection of the Lord—he adds, by a similar mode of speech, We say that Christ is still sacrificed. Here are his words: "Was not Christ once sacrificed in himself? and, nevertheless, he is sacrificed for the people in the Sacrament, not only in all the solemnities of Easter, but also every day: nor does he by any means lie, who, being asked, answers that he is sacrificed." Observe then, this good Doctor teaches that Jesus Christ is sacrificed every day in the same way that he dies every Friday before Easter, and is raised from the dead every Sabbath, not in reality, but commemoratively. He

adds: "For if the Sacraments had not some resemblance to the things of which they are the sacred signs, they would not be Sacraments at all. But, on account of this resemblance, they, for the most part, take the names of things themselves. As the Sacrament of the body of Christ is in some manner the body of Christ, and the Sacrament of his blood is his blood; so also the Sacrament of Faith—namely, Baptism—is Faith." These words, without doubt, strike our opponents with pain to the very heart: for what testimony can be more explicit? Would it not be intolerable to hear it said that the consecrated host is the body of Christ in some manner? Or, that it is the body of Christ in the same manner that Jesus Christ dies every Friday before Easter—and in the same manner that baptism is faith—and that that is a Sacrament which takes the name of the thing signified?

The same Father on the third Psalm: "The Lord admitted Judas to the banquet, at which he commended and gave to his disciples the figure of his body and blood." In his third book on Christian Doctrine, c. 16: "When the Lord said, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you, he seems to command a wicked action and a great crime. It is, therefore, a figure, enjoining the communicating in the passion of the Lord gently and usefully, putting us in remembrance that his flesh was wounded and crucified for us." Observe, Augustine does not only affirm that these words, Except ye eat, &c., are figurative, but likewise explains the meaning of the figure, saying that it signifies the duty of meditating with pleasure and profit on Christ's having died for us.—This is an exposition which our adversaries do not approve.

The same author remarks, in his first Treatise upon the first Epistle of John: "The Lord consoles us, who can-

not any more handle him with our hands, but who may touch him by faith." And in the 53d Sermon on our Lord's words, "indeed, almost all call the Sacrament or sacred sign Christ's body:" these words are very well worthy of notice.

In the 27th Treatise upon John: "The Capernaites thought that it behoved him to distribute his body to them, but he said unto them, that he would verily ascend entire into heaven. When ye see the Son of Man ascending up where he was before, you will then, at least, certainly perceive that he does not give his body in the manner ye imagine,—you will then, at least, certainly learn that his grace is not consumed by mouthfuls." The passage of the same Father, on the 98th Ps. especially seems to me to be very express, where explaining these words of our Lord, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, ye have no life in you," he introduces the Lord speaking thus: "Understand spiritually what I say unto you:—you shall not eat this body which you see, nor drink the blood which shall be shed by those who shall crucify me. I have commended to you a sacred sign, which, being spiritually understood, will give you life."

According to the doctrine of our adversaries, both the righteous and the wicked receive the body of the Lord in the Eucharist. For many participate in the Sacrament faithlessly and hypocritically. Such persons refrain not from swallowing the consecrated host, and, if we may believe our opponents, do really and truly eat the body of Jesus Christ. Augustine combats this opinion, and maintains that wicked men do not receive Jesus Christ, but eat merely the signs of his body. In his 26th Treatise upon John: "He who dwells not in Christ, and in whom Christ does not dwell, undoubtedly does not eat his flesh and

drink his blood spiritually, although he carnally and visibly bruise with the teeth the sacred sign of Christ's body and blood." In the Augustine Sentences collected by Prosper: "Whoever disagrees with Jesus Christ, does not eat his flesh nor drink his blood, although he daily take without concern the sacred sign *(Sacramentum)* of so glorious an object, to the condemnation of his own presumption." And in the City of God, b. xxi. c. xxv.: "It ought not to be said that he eats the body of Christ who is not in Christ's body." And there Christ is also introduced as saying, "He who dwells not in me, and in whom I do not dwell, neither says nor thinks that he eats my body or drinks my blood. They, therefore, do not dwell in Christ who are not his members."

Jerome expresses himself in a similar manner on the last chapter of Isaiah: "Whilst they are not holy in body and spirit, they do not eat the flesh of Jesus, nor drink the blood of which he himself spake, Whoso eateth my flesh," &c.

It must not be thought strange that I have translated the word sacramentum, a "sacred sign," in these quotations from Augustine, since he himself explains it in the same way in his fifth Epistle to Marcellinus: "Signs, when they belong to divine things, are called Sacraments." And in the City of God:* "The visible sacrifice is the sacrament—that is, the sacred sign of the invisible sacrifice." And in the Treatise against the Adversary of the Law and the Prophets,† *Sacramenta, id est, sacra signa*, the sacraments—that is, the sacred signs. The definition which Lombard gives ‡ coincides with that of Augustine: *Sacramentum est sacrae rei signum.* Bellarmine himself

---

* Lib. x. c. v.—† Lib. ii. c. ix.—‡ Lib. iv. tit. 3, dist. 1.

says, in the first book on the Sacraments:* "The word Sacrament signifies the sign of a sacred or secret thing.'

It strikingly appears how very far Augustine was from believing in transubstantiation by this one thing, that, in these words, This is my body, by the word body he understood the Church. At the end of the works of Fulgentius, the disciple of Augustine, there is a sermon of his great master's, which hath been maliciously torn away from his works, and which would have been lost, had not Fulgentius and Bede preserved it. Here, then, are Augustine's own words: "That which you have seen is bread and wine, according to what your eyes informed you; but according to the instruction your faith requires, the bread is the body of Christ, and the cup is his blood."†

Bellarmine admits, in the first book of the Eucharist, ch. i., that the words, "The bread is the body of Christ," cannot be true, unless they be taken figuratively. But let us enquire in what manner Augustine understood the bread to be the body of Christ. He asks, then, "how is it that the bread is the body of Christ? and how is it that the cup is his blood? These things, brethren, are called Sacraments, because one thing is seen in them, and another is understood. That which is seen has a corporeal form, and that which is understood is a spiritual fruit. If you would, therefore, know what the body of Christ is, hearken to the Apostle, saying to the faithful, Ye are the body and members of Christ. If ye then be the body and members of Christ, your mystery is placed on the table of the Lord," &c. The same explanation is given in his twenty-sixth Treatise upon John: "By this meat and drink, the Lord

---

* Ch. vii. and xi.—† Aug. Serm. ad infantes.

designed that we should understand the communion of his body and members, namely the holy Church of the predestinated."

In the Roman Decretal, second Dist. of the Consecration in the Canon, Hoc est: "The heavenly bread, which is the flesh of Christ, is in its own manner called the body of Christ; although, to speak truly, it is merely the Sacrament, or sacred sign of Christ's body—namely, of that visible, palpable, mortal body, which was placed on the cross." The Gloss of the Doctors upon these words is truly excellent: "The heavenly Sacrament, which truly represents the flesh of Christ, is called Christ's body, but improperly; for it is so called after its own mode, but not according to the reality of the thing, but by a significant mystery. The meaning then is, it is called the body of Christ, because Christ's body is signified."

Cyprian, in his sixty-third Epistle, desires water to be mingled with the wine in the sacred cup. His reason is, that as the wine is the blood of Christ, so also the water is the people; and that the people ought not to be separated from Christ. "If any one (says he) offer only wine, the blood of Christ begins to be without us; but if water only, the people begin to be without Christ." Whence it follows, that as Cyprian did not believe water to be transubstantiated into the people, neither did he believe the wine to be transubstantiated into the body of Christ. In the same Epistle, "it was wine which Christ called his blood." And in his seventy-sixth Epistle, "the Lord called the bread, composed of many grains, his body."

We have a treatise upon the two natures of Christ, written against the Nestorians and Eutychians, by Pope Gelasius, about A.D. 495. It contains a sentence which bears very hard upon our opponents: "Assuredly the Sacra-

ments which we take of the body and blood of Christ are divine things, whereby we also, through them, are made partakers of the divine nature ; yet the substance or nature of bread and wine do still remain : and the image and similitude of Christ's body and blood are without doubt celebrated in the action of the mysteries." Observe, he contends against the Eutychians, who hold that the substance of Christ's body had passed away, and was changed into the divine nature. The dispute here was not concerning the change of accidents, but of the substance, which, Gelasius maintained, continued in the body of Christ, like as the substance of bread remained in the Sacrament. Now there can be no doubt that this book was the production of Gelasius, bishop of Rome, since Fulgentius, his contemporary, quotes it in the second Proposition of the book to Ferrand the deacon, and ascribes it to Gelasius.

Fulgentius, Augustine's disciple, writes to Trasimund,* " How is Jesus Christ ascended into heaven unless he be a local and true man ? or how is he present with the faithful except he be the infinite and true God?" In the nineteenth chapter of the book concerning Faith, he likewise writes to Peter the deacon : " The holy Catholic Church throughout the world in this present time, that is to say, under the New Testament, ceases not to offer to Jesus Christ, with the Father and the Holy Spirit, with whom he is united in Godhead, a sacrifice of bread and wine in faith and love. For in the fleshy victims [of the Old Testament] there was a figure of the flesh of Christ which he was to offer for our sins, he being without sin. But in this sacrifice [of the Eucharist] is celebrated an action of thanksgiving and commemoration of the flesh of Christ

* Lib. ii. c. xvii.

which he offered for us, and of his blood, which he who is himself God, shed for us." Besides his calling the Holy Supper a commemoration and a sacrifice of bread and wine, it is very remarkable that he says that this sacrifice of bread and wine is offered to Jesus Christ. It is hence manifest that the sacrifice is not Jesus Christ himself; for Jesus Christ is not sacrificed to Jesus Christ.

Facundus, an African bishop, wrote, A.D. 550, in defence of the three heads or points of the Council of Chalcedon: "The Sacrament of Adoption (namely Baptism) may be called adoption in the same way that the Sacrament of his body and blood in the bread and consecrated cup is called his body and blood; not that the bread properly speaking is his body nor the cup his blood, but because they contain in them the mystery of his body and blood." This book of Facundus, taken from the Vatican Library, was given to the light of day by the Jesuit James Sirmond, who on that account became suspected, and has I learn been put to much trouble about it. The Jesuits Turrianus, Vasquez, and Gregory of Valentia, start an objection against themselves, from the Epistle of Chrysostom to Cesarius, which is also found quoted in the Bibliotheca Patrum, printed at Cologne A. D. 1618. The passage is as follows: "Before the bread is sanctified we call it bread, but after it is sanctified by divine grace through the instrumentality of the priest, it is freed from the appellation bread, and is honoured with the name of the Lord's body, although the nature of bread remains in it." These Jesuits answer, that this passage belongs not to John Chrysostom, but to another John of Constantinople. They affirm this without proof. Nevertheless, it does not concern us, for it is sufficient that they admit the passage to belong to an ancient author.

The eight books of the Apostolical Constitutions, attributed to Clement I., bishop of Rome, are not his; they are ancient, however, and afford much information. In book 5, c. 16, it said that, "when Jesus gave the typical mysteries, he went to the mountain of Olives." And in book 7, c. 26: "We render thee thanks for the precious blood of Jesus Christ, which was shed for us,—and for his precious body, the signs of which we celebrate, by his commandment, to shew forth his death."

We should never have done were we to collect all the passages in which the ancients affirm, that what we receive in the Eucharist is bread, and that the bread and wine are symbols, figures, types, and antitypes of the body and blood of the Lord: I will add two Canons of Councils, which appear to me to be very explicit.

The twenty-fourth Canon of the third Council of Carthage enjoins: "That nothing be offered in the sacred service, but the body and blood of the Lord, as the Lord ordained—that is to say, bread, and wine mingled with water." This Canon was re-enacted, in the same words, by the Council of Trullo, and stands Canon thirty-second both in the Greek and Latin copies. Balsamon makes the following Commentary upon it: "The thirty-second Canon of the Synod of Trullo ordains, at great length, that the unbloody sacrifice should be celebrated with bread, and with wine and water mingled, because the bread is the figure of the Lord's body, and the wine the figure of his blood."—Here, therefore, are above two hundred bishops assembled in Council, who interpret the words, "the body and blood of Christ," by bread, and wine mingled with water. The same Council ordains, in the twenty-third Canon, that, "when assisting at the altar, prayer must be addressed always to the Father." Whence it appears, that the Sacrament

was not then worshipped, since the Council forbids the person officiating at the altar, to address prayers to Jesus Christ. If the host be Jesus Christ, it must be worshipped, and consequently must be invoked.

To shew how late this opinion of transubstantiation was in being received, we have in the tome De divinis officiis of the Bibliotheca Patrum, an epistle of the great Emperor Charlemagne to Alcuin, in which he says, "Christ, when supping with his disciples, broke bread, and likewise gave the cup to them, in figure of his body and blood." This epistle was probably written about A.D. 800.

Walfridus Strabo, who wrote about A.D. 850, says, in the book concerning Ecclesiastical Affairs, c. 16: "The Lord, at the last supper he had with his disciples, before he was betrayed, after ending the solemnities of the ancient Passover, gave to his disciples the sacred signs (or sacraments) of his body and blood in the SUBSTANCE of bread and wine, and taught them to celebrate them in commemoration of his most holy passion."

The Abbé Rupert of Duyts, near Cologne, who lived in A.D. 1112, whose works are still extant, condemned transubstantiation, and taught that the substance of bread remained after consecration. Here are his words on Exod. xii.: "As Christ neither changed nor destroyed the human nature, but assumed it to himself—in like manner, he neither changed nor destroyed the substance of bread and wine in the Sacrament, but assumed them into the unity of his body and blood." This passage of Rupert is quoted by Salmeron, in his ninth tome, Treatise 16, § Ruit. Bellarmine likewise quotes many similar passages from the same author, and condemns them in his book of Ecclesiastical Writers.

To the numerous passages which affirm that the substance of bread remains after consecration, our opponents answer,

that by the word *substance* the Fathers understood *accidents*. There is equally as much absurdity in understanding *substance* by the word *accidents*, as in understanding *accidents* by the word *substance*. If it be permitted thus to pervert the Fathers, and to understand them when they say white to mean black, there would never be any thing certain. Assuredly, if by the word substance the Fathers had meant accidents, they would have said substances in the plural. Since accidents mean more than one, our opponents must choose one out of the number, which may be called substance. But this shuffling is refuted by Theodoret, in his second dialogue, where he says, that "the bread, after consecration, remains in its first substance, form, and figure." For here he expressly distinguishes the substance from the accidents. But as the error of the corporal presence of Christ's body, under the species of bread, began to arise, in the time of Charles the Bald, about A.D. 870, a priest named Bertram, wrote a book, which is still extant, expressly against this error. On this account, Bellarmine ranks him among heretics, in his first book, c. 1, on the Eucharist; but Bertram passed his whole life in honour, and never received any reprehension upon this subject.

CHAPTER XXVII.

Confirmation of the same, by the Customs of the Ancient Church.

This truth is confirmed by ancient customs, which were different from what is now practised in the Mass, and were incompatible with Transubstantiation; for in the ancient church the service was performed in a language understood

by the auditory. Every one communicated in both species. The people offered a quantity of bread and wine upon the sacred table, and not light round wafers. The people, men as well as women, received the sacrament with the hand, which many of them carried home.* The fragments of sacred bread that remained on the table after communion were burnt,† or were given to the children returning from school, or were carried to the priests' houses, to be eaten there.‡ There were no private masses; no festival of Corpus Christi; nor was the consecrated host carried in procession. Ambrose,§ in the book concerning widows, says, that widows were employed to administer the sacrament. In the Roman Order, which is in the Bibliotheca Patrum,‖ the following words are found: "After a virgin hath communicated, let her reserve as much of the communion elements as will enable her to communicate during the space of eight days." The sacrament would never have been given to young women, to be kept for so long a time, had transubstantiation been then believed. It is certain that the ancient church did not adore the sacrament. There are no doubt certain passages in the Fathers wherein it is said that we worship Jesus Christ in the Eucharist. But it is one thing to worship Jesus Christ in the action of the Sacrament, and another thing to worship the sacrament. The Father and the Holy Spirit are likewise worshipped in the Eucharist.

It is useless to quote some ancient Fathers who speak of the elevation of the sacrament. For elevation does not ne-

---

* Cyprian. Serm. de Lapsis —Euseb. Hist. lib. vii. c. 9.—Theod. Hist. lib. v. c. 18.—Nazianz. Orat. de Gorgonia.—† Hesychius, lib. ii. in Lev. c. 8.—Ivo, part ii. de Sacr. c. 59.—Burch. lib. 5, c. 12. ‡ Evag. lib. iv. c. 36.—§ Ambrose, lib. de Viduis.—‖ Editionis Parisiensis, anno 1624, colum. 161.

cessarily infer adoration; seeing that by the law of Moses the priest elevated the breast and shoulder of the victim, and a handful of the first fruits for a wave offering, without adoring them.* Besides, this elevation was in no respect like the elevation which the priest now makes of the host above his head, turning his back upon the people, and tinkling his little bell. But at that time the priest, having uncovered the bread and the wine, took the plate with both hands and held it up to shew it to the people, and that before pronouncing the words called consecration.

CHAPTER XXVIII.

Explanation of the Passages of the Fathers, wherein they say that we eat the body and blood of the Lord in the Eucharist,—that the bread is changed into the body of Christ, and is made the body of Christ,—particularly of Ambrose, Hilary, and Chrysostom,—that the Fathers speak of various kinds of body and blood in Christ.

There are three kinds of body of Christ mentioned in the holy Scripture, namely, his natural body, which he took in the womb of the Virgin Mary,—his mystical body, which is the Church,—and his sacramental or commemorative body, which is the bread of the Holy Supper. Imitating the style of Scripture, the Fathers, beside the mystical body of Christ which is the church, speak of two other bodies of Christ, namely, of his natural body, and of

* Exod. xxix. 2—4; Levit. viii. 27 and 29; Numb. v. 25.

his sacramental or symbolical body; of which last they speak as of a thing divine and full of mystery, and of a spiritual flesh formed by the ineffable power of God, by means and for purposes which we shall mention hereafter. They speak also of two kinds of blood in Christ,—the one natural, the other divine and mystical, which we receive in the Sacrament.

Clemens Alexandrinus, in the second book of the Pedagogue, ch. ii. says, "Christ's blood is of two kinds,—the one the blood of the fleshly body by which we are redeemed from corruption; the other, namely, that by which we are anointed, is spiritual; and it is by drinking of this blood of the Lord that we become partakers of his incorruption.

St. Jerome, on the Epistle to the Ephesians, says, "The flesh of Christ is understood in two ways; it is either spiritual and divine, of which he himself said, My flesh is meat indeed; or it is that flesh which was crucified, and that blood which was shed by the soldier's spear." This passage is cited in the Roman Decretal, second Distinction of the Consecration in the Canon Dupliciter. A quotation from the same Father upon Leviticus is also made in the same Distinction in the Canon De Hac, in these words: "It is, indeed, lawful to eat of this host, which is admirably made in commemoration of Christ; but of that sacrifice itself which Christ offered upon the altar of the cross, it is not lawful for any to eat." And in the same place in the Canon Corpus, taken from Augustine, "We call that which was taken of the fruits of the earth, and consecrated by mystical prayer, the body and blood of the Lord." Assuredly a body of Christ taken of the fruits of the earth is not the body of Christ crucified for us.

Tertullian, in the sixth chapter of his Book on Prayer,

says, " The bread is the word of the living God which came down from heaven." Likewise, " The body which is held to be in the bread, This is my body."

Eusebius of Cesarea, in his Ecclesiastical Theology :* " The Lord did not speak of the flesh which he took, but of his mystical body and blood."

St. Augustine often calls what we receive in the Holy Supper the body of Christ ; but lest we should think that what we receive by the mouth to be the body of Christ which was crucified for us, he introduces Jesus Christ as declaring: "Ye shall not eat this body which ye see, nor drink that blood which shall be shed by those who will crucify me." What then ? " I have commended to you a Sacrament, which being spiritually received, shall quicken you."

Ambrose, in his Commentary upon Luke, c. 17, expounds these words of the Lord, " wheresoever the body is, thither will the eagles be gathered together," and marks very distinctly the difference between the two kinds of the body of Christ. First, he says, that by body may be understood the dead body of Jesus Christ ; and by the eagles gathered about it, Mary the wife of Cleophas, and Mary Magdalene, and Mary the Mother of our Lord : then he adds, " there is also another body, of which it is said, My flesh is meat indeed."

In the Mysteries of the Mass,† Pope Innocent III. expressly distinguishes these two kinds of flesh or body of Christ, saying, " the form of bread comprehends both kinds of flesh of Christ—namely, the real and the mystical."

The Jesuit Salmeron‡ adopts the forementioned distinction of the two kinds of Christ's blood, from the book on the Lord's Supper, attributed to Cyprian : " The reason

---

* Lib. iii. c. xii.—† Lib. iv. c. 36.—‡ Tom. ix. Tract. 15.

(says he) why it was forbidden in the law to eat blood, and was commanded in the Gospel, is excellently stated by Cyprian, in the book on the Lord's Supper. For, by abstinence from blood, spiritual and rational life is denoted, which is far removed from brutish manners. But we drink of the blood of Christ, human as well as divine, that we may know that in tasting of it we are called to the participation of divine and eternal life."

We have quoted Ephrem in the preceding chapter, calling the bread of the Eucharist the body of Christ, and yet affirming that "that body does not lose the substance of bread." And in the Canon, Hoc est, in the second Distinction of the Consecration, extracted from Augustine, it is said, that "the bread, which is the flesh of Christ, is after its manner called the body of Christ, although, in truth, it be only the sacred sign of his body."

Augustine elsewhere says, "the Lord made no difficulty of saying, This is my body, when he gave the sign of his body." And Theodoret asserts, that "the Lord gave to the sign the name of his body." And Origen calls the bread of the Supper, "Christ's figurative body."

The same thing appears clearer even than day, from this fact, that the Fathers, who say we eat the body of the Lord in the Eucharist, attribute to it things which do not accord with the natural body of Jesus Christ, born of the Virgin, and crucified for us. St. Cyprian says, in his seventy-sixth Epistle: "The Lord called the bread, which is made and composed of many grains, his body;" and in his sixty-third Epistle: "The body of the Lord does not consist in flour alone, nor in water alone, but only by the commixture and kneading together of both." Certainly this body of Christ, composed of many grains, and baked with water, cannot be the body which was crucified for us.

Justin saith, in his second Apology, that " the Deacons give to every one of those present to partake of the bread and wine and water, over which thanksgivings have been offered." Then he adds, " that this bread is the body of Christ." But he shews clearly that it is not the same with that which was crucified for us, by declaring, that " it is a food, by the transmutation of which, our flesh and blood are nourished." He speaks of the change made by digestion; for our bodies are not nourished with the body that was crucified for us, that body is not changed into our flesh and our blood. That Justin did not believe in transubstantiation, is sufficiently manifest from his dialogue against Tryphon, where he says, " the oblation of fine flour was a figure of the bread in the Eucharist, which our Lord Jesus commanded to be made in commemoration of his passion."

That Irenaeus held the same opinion, appears from his fifth book: " The Lord affirmed that the cup, which is a creature causing our bodies to increase, is his body. Could Irenaeus have so far lost his senses as to believe that our bodies are increased and nourished by the crucified body of the Lord, and by the blood shed upon the cross, which never re-entered his body?

This distinction in the writings of the ancients, of two kinds of Christ's body, appears also in what they say about the pieces of Christ's body in the Sacrament, and about the fragments of Christ's body remaining on the table after communion. Such modes of speech are inapplicable to Christ's natural body, crucified for us, which cannot be broken, consequently of which there can be no fragments. Pope Gelasius, in the Canon *Comperimus*, in second Distinction of the Consecration: " We have learned that some, having taken one part of the body of Christ, abstain from the cup;" this he designates a sacrilege. And the historian

Evagrius* informs us, that "The ancient custom in the royal city requires, when many PIECES of Christ's immaculate body remain, that the children going to school, and not yet old enough to be corrupted, be called to eat them."—How could they give them the natural body of Jesus Christ seated at the right hand of God? What probability is there of the remaining fragments of the Lord's body being given to a crowd of little children? Would not such an act be esteemed a horrible profanation by the Romish Church at the present time? It is, no doubt, very common with the Fathers to say, "*Panis est corpus Christi*, the bread is Christ's body." We have already heard Augustine say so; and were his words understood of Christ's natural body, they would be false. For the bread is not Christ's body crucified for us.

Our opponents, therefore, act very unfairly in their ostentatious production of passages from the books on the Sacraments attributed to St. Ambrose, and from the book on the Lord's Supper attributed to Cyprian, in which it is said, the bread after consecration becomes, and is made, Christ's body; since we can shew by so many proofs, and shall shew by still more decisive ones hereafter, that they speak of another flesh, and of another body, than that which was born of the Virgin and was crucified. For that the author of the books attributed to Ambrose believed that the bread after consecration was still bread, is manifest from his saying, "let us establish this therefore, namely, how that which is bread can be the body of Christ."† And a little after: "If there be such power in the word of the Lord as to cause things which were not to begin to be, how much more effective will it be in causing things which were

---

* Lib. iv. c. xxxvi. —† De Sacramentis, lib. iv. c. iv.

to continue, and be changed into others?" This excellent passage, which affirms that the things which were still are, —that is to say, that what was bread is so still,—is found quoted as above, by Lombard, in the fourth book of Sentences, Dist. 10; and by Thomas, in the third part of his Sum, Quest. 78, Art. 4; by Gratian, in the second Dist. of the Consecration, in the Canon Panis est; also by Gabriel Biel, Alger, Ivo Carnutensis, and Iodocus Coccius; and not as it is in the late editions of Ambrose, in which these words, *Sint quae erant*, are struck out. Such falsifications are very numerous in late editions.

Some of the Fathers, indeed, say, in certain parts of their works, that the Eucharistical bread is the crucified body of the Lord. But such expressions ought to be understood in the same way as that of Jesus, who said that the bread was his body, and the cup was the New Testament, namely, because they are the commemoration of them.

Some object a passage of Hilary, in the eighth book on the Trinity, where he says, "Of the truth of the flesh and blood, there remains no room for doubt. For at this day, both by the profession of the Lord and by our faith, it is truly flesh and truly blood; and these things taken and swallowed, cause us to be in Christ and Christ in us."— First of all, it is a great imposition to urge Hilary, who, in reference to the nature of Christ's body, maintained an error which annihilates the whole of the Christian religion; for he teaches that Christ suffered no pain in death; and that the stripes inflicted on him were as if one had pierced the air or flame with a dart.* Secondly, Hilary manifestly speaks of spiritual manducation; for it is by it alone that we are in Christ and Christ in us. And, thirdly, when

* Hilar. De Trinit. lib. 10.

Hilary says there is no room to doubt of the flesh and blood of the Lord, he does not mean to say, it is not to be doubted that in the Eucharist we eat verily with the mouth the natural flesh of the Lord; but he says it must not be doubted that Jesus had a true body and true blood,—for he disputes against the heretics who denied the truth of his human nature.

With regard to the Mystagogical Catechism, attributed to Cyril of Jerusalem, from which it is objected, that we must not believe our senses which inform us that it is bread, it is certain that they are supposititious, and are falsely ascribed to Cyril. For the style of these catechetical discourses is very different from that of the preceding eighteen which are Cyril's, and are quoted by Theodore, Gelasius, and Damascenus. But these others are not cited by any one. There is an evident mark of forgery in the first Catechism; for the author there dissuades his hearers from frequenting the amphitheatre, where the chases and combats of gladiators with wild beasts took place; and from the hippodrome or circus, that is to say, the park, where horse races and combats were held; for there were no such edifices nor spectacles in Jerusalem at that time, nor ever have been since it was a Christian city.

As to the hyperbolical amplifications of Chrysostom, who says that the altar flows with blood, that we fix our teeth in Christ's flesh, put our fingers into his wound, and suck his blood; and that a seraph brings a burning coal with a pair of tongs. These are extravagant expressions characterising his vehement declamation, and are disbelieved even by our adversaries themselves.

CHAPTER XXIX.

That several of the Fathers believed a mystical union of Christ's Divinity with the Sacramental bread.

I cannot, however, dissemble that several of the Fathers entertained an opinion which the Romish Church now very properly rejects. They teach, that as there is a personal union between the divine and human nature of Jesus Christ, there is also, in virtue of consecration, a union, though not personal and hypostatic, nevertheless, a mystical, divine, and ineffable union, between his divine nature and the Eucharistical bread, by which the bread remaining bread, becomes the body of Christ. This opinion has no foundation in Scripture. However, I venture to say, that it is an error which is in no way prejudicial to the Christian religion ;—for this opinion does not change the nature of Jesus Christ, nor destroy his humanity; nor does it change the nature of the Sacrament, since they did not believe that there was any change in the substance of the bread. They, therefore, did not adore the Sacrament, nor fall into idolatry. In short, it was an innocent error which served to increase the respect and reverence of the people for the holy Sacrament, and induced them to call it terrible and admirable. We have in it, however, an evident proof that these Fathers did not believe in transubstantiation ; for, as they did not believe that the human nature of Christ was trausubstantiated or abolished by its union with his divinity,—neither did they believe that the bread was destroyed, nor changed into another substance, by its divine and mystical union with the divinity of Jesus.

By this doctrine, the Eucharistical bread is the body of Christ in two ways: the one on account of its mystical union with Christ, even as the man Jesus is called the Son of God, on account of his personal union with the Son of God; the other because the bread is the sacred sign and commemoration of Christ's body, agreeably to the custom of giving to the signs the names of the things signified. For this second reason, they say the bread of the Eucharist is the body which was born of the Virgin, and which was crucified for us. As to the first reason, it is certain that the bread, which they say is made the body of Christ by mystical union, is not the same body of Christ as was crucified for us; for, to effect this change, they interpose the Almighty power of God, seeing that it necessarily requires a divine power to cause the bread remaining bread to be so closely united to the divinity of Christ, as to be the body of Christ.

But that these Fathers held that Christ's mystical body is a different body in substance from that which was crucified for us, although it be the same in signification, we shall now prove by various quotations from their writings, in which they say that Jesus Christ had two kinds of flesh, and that we are permitted to eat the flesh or mystical body, it being taken sacramentally; but are by no means suffered to eat the flesh that was crucified for us.

The first Father who employs the personal union of the two natures of Jesus, for shewing how the bread is made the body of Christ, not by transubstantiation, but by the mystical union of his divinity with the bread, is Justin Martyr, toward the end of his second Apology, where he speaks thus: "We do not take these things as common bread, but as Christ became incarnate, and was made flesh and blood for our salvation, so have we likewise been taught that the

food, over which thanks have been offered by prayer of the Word, and by transmutation* of which our flesh is nourished, is the body and blood of Jesus." But Justin, by saying, it nourishes our bodies, shews that he believed that this food was always bread, and did not lose its substance; and further confirms it, by stating that, "the Deacons give to all present, that they may partake of the bread and wine, over which thanks have been offered."

The author of the Catechetical prayer, attributed to Gregory of Nyssen,† uses the same comparison: "The body is changed into a divine dignity by the inhabitation of the God Word. With good reason, therefore, do I now believe also that bread sanctified by the Word of God is changed into the body of the God Word." If this comparison be good, then, as the body of Christ is not transubstantiated by the inhabitation of the divinity, neither, in like manner, can the bread be transubstantiated by the consecration performed in the Sacrament.

Hilary speaks after the same manner, in the eighth book of the Trinity: "If the Word was verily made flesh, we also partake of the Word flesh in the meat of the Lord."

Gratian quotes the following passage, which he says is Augustine's, in the second Distinction of the Consecration, and is extracted from Prosper's Sentences: "The Sacrifice of the Church is composed of two things, namely, the Sacrament and the thing of the Sacrament, that is of the body of Christ, like as the person of Christ is composed of God and man. For Christ is true God and true man."

---

* By this transmutation, he means the digestion of the bread in the stomach for the nourishment of our bodies.

† I shew this falsity in my book against Cardinal Perron, b. vii c. xxii., particularly in what he says about Severus, a heretic, who lived more than a hundred years after the death of Gregory.

Irenaeus has a very peculiar opinion. He says that the bread is the body of Christ, because Christ is the creator of all things; for he imagines that the world has the same relation to God, as the body of man has to his soul. This was the belief of Plato, Cicero, Virgil, and of the whole Platonic school, which was in great vogue in the age of Irenaeus.

The author of the book upon the Lord's Supper, attributed to Cyprian, holds the same belief. That author speaks thus: "Common bread being changed into flesh and blood, communicates life and growth to the body; and, therefore, the weakness of our faith being assisted in the usual effect, is taught, by sensible proofs, that in the visible Sacraments there is a cause operative of eternal life." When he says, "common bread is changed into flesh and blood," he does not mean that it is changed into the body and blood of Christ, but into our flesh and blood by digestion; for he adds, that this bread nourishes our bodies, and promotes their growth; and this is confirmed by the whole bearing of his speech. But it is in the words that he shortly after subjoins, that our adversaries, from not rightly understanding that belief, exult in imagined victory.—"The bread (says he) which the Lord gave to his disciples being changed, not in appearance but in nature, is made flesh by the Omnipotence of the Word." But he shews in what follows, that this change of bread into the flesh of Christ is not effected by transubstantiation, but by a union of Christ's divinity with the bread, similar to the union of his divine and human nature; for he subsequently adds, "and even as we see the humanity in the person of Christ whilst the divinity is hid, so also the divine essence is infused in an inexpressible manner into the visible sacrament." There is nothing more explicit nor more ad-

verse to transubstantiation; for, according to the belief of this author, as the divine nature of Christ hath not transubstantiated his humanity, but made it become the flesh of the Son of God, so the divine essence, which he says is infused into the Sacramental bread, makes it become the body of Christ without transubstantiating it. Moreover, he also says, a little after, that what we receive in the Sacrament "is unleavened bread, by whose touch we are sanctified;" thus acknowledging that it is always bread.

Bellarmine, in the fifteenth chapter of his third book upon the Eucharist, cites St. Remi, who wrote in the following terms, about A.D. 890: "The flesh which the Word of God, the Father, took in the womb of the Virgin into unity of person, and the bread consecrated in church, are one and the same body. For the fulness of divinity which was in that flesh, fills also this bread." Bellarmine adds, that Haymo held the same language; and that the words of Gelasius and Theodoret, which we quoted above, are irreconcileable with this opinion.

The author quoted with most ostentation by our adversaries is Damascenus, to whom they assign a place among the saints. This person might well be called the Lombard of the Greeks, because he is the first Grecian who treated of theology in philosophical terms: he is the first also who wrote in favour of image worship. He wrote about A.D. 740. In the first book of the Orthodox Faith, c. xliv., he enlarges upon this subject, and pretends that the bread *is changed* into the Lord's body, not by *transubstantiation*, but by *assumption* and union with the divinity, like the union of his divine with his human nature; "because (says he) it is the custom to eat bread and drink wine and water, the Lord conjoined his divinity to these things, and made them his body and blood." And shortly after, "If

thou inquirest in what manner that is done, let it suffice thee to know, that it is done by the Holy Spirit, in the same way that the Lord formed for himself and by himself a body, taken of the Holy Mother of God, by the Holy Ghost." And further, he says that the bread and the wine are "the body of Christ deified." Above all, he has subjoined this explicit declaration: "The communion bread is not simple bread, but is united with the divinity." But he always acknowledges that it is bread, saying, that the bread is the body of Christ, and calls it "the bread of communion." And afterwards, he says that the shew-bread prefigured this bread." Likewise, "this bread is the first-fruit of the future bread." And again, "We all partake of the same bread." His only peculiarity of opinion is, that he disapproves of the bread being called a figure of Christ's body, rejecting a mode of speech common among the Fathers who wrote before him.

It likewise appears, that he would have the Sacrament honoured but not worshipped. "Let us honour it (says he) with corporeal and spiritual purity:" and he recommends the receiving it with the hands placed in the form of a cross. For it was not yet customary to thrust the host into the mouth of communicants.

Rupert was imbued with the same opinion. "Even as Christ neither changed nor destroyed the human nature but assumed it, so in the Sacrament he neither destroyed nor changed the substance of bread and wine, but assumed them into unity with his body and blood."* On this account Bellarmine ranks him among the Impanators.

This doctrine has no connexion with that of ubiquity. For it asserts this union of Christ with the bread only in

* Rupertus Tuitiensis, in Exod. cap. 12.

the Sacrament, which induces no change on his natural body. But these Fathers ascribe two bodies to Christ, the one his natural body which is in heaven, the other the sacramental bread, which they account his body in two ways; namely, because it is united with his divinity by a union similar to the hypostatic union of his two natures; and because it is the sign, figure, and symbol of his natural body, which name it hath obtained according to the custom of giving to signs the name of the things signified. Whence also they sometimes call the bread Christ's body, born of the Virgin, and crucified for us.

Whoever rightly comprehends this has a key in his hand opening to him the understanding of the Fathers, and solving every difficulty for him. It affords a solution of the passages objected to us of Cyril, and from the books on the Sacraments, attributed to Ambrose. For the real author of the book on the Sacraments was one of the Impanators, since he holds that the bread becomes the body of Christ by the ineffable power of God, and that, notwithstanding, it still remains bread, as we have proved; and have also quoted the form of service then used, wherein it was said, "the oblation we offer was the *figure* of Christ's body."* And in chap. 4: "Let us establish this, namely, how THAT WHICH IS BREAD may be the body of Christ." And afterwards he says that the bread and wine remain what they were, and are, nevertheless, changed into the body of the Lord. We must not be surprised, if to effect this change in the Sacramental bread, he employs the omnipotence and ineffable power of God; for, in truth, if this union which he conceives were real, it would be an ineffable

* Ambrose de Sacram. lib. 4, cap. 5.

and incomprehensible work, into which human reason could not penetrate.

On account of this mystical union, and its near approach to the personal union, Cyril of Alexandria says, that the body of Christ received into our bodies, renders them susceptible of resurrection. This is a glaring error; because, receiving the Sacrament should, for the same reason, deliver us from dying. Believers under the Old Testament, and John the Baptist, and the thief crucified with Jesus, and a countless number of martyrs, never received the Sacrament, but are not, therefore, the less susceptible of resurrection.

From this impanation arose the custom of many private individuals carrying the Eucharist home with them, and keeping it enclosed in a box or cupboard, as did Gorgonia, the sister of Gregory of Nazianzen. Hence we know, on the one hand, that they ascribed to the bread something more than being a mere sign and figure of Christ's body. It is also manifest, on the other hand, that they did not believe in transubstantiation; for they never would have put the natural body of Jesus into the hands of a woman, to be shut into a cabinet.

From the same opinion proceeded the conduct of Satyrus,* brother of Ambrose, before he was baptized. Being in danger of shipwreck at sea, he had the Eucharist administered to him, hung it around his neck, leaped into the sea, and sought safety by swimming—an evident proof that there was a belief of some secret virtue being in the Sacrament: nevertheless, it was not believed that the bread was the natural body of Christ, crucified for us; for, never would it have been given to an unbaptized person, to be hung about his neck, and cast into the sea.

---

* Ambr. Oratione de obitu fratris Satyri.

Nor is it to be omitted that the Fathers never speak of species of bread in the plural, but in the singular only, for by this word they understood substance, which means unity. But our adversaries, who vitiate the language as well as the doctrine of the Fathers, speak of species of bread in the plural, because they thereby mean accidents without a subject, which are many: this is a novel doctrine, and a mode of speech never once used, either by philosophers, or even by the Fathers, or the whole of antiquity.

CHAPTER XXX.

The particular opinion of Augustine, Fulgentius, and Innocent III.

Augustine and his disciple Fulgentius, sometimes take these words in a sense peculiar to themselves; for, besides Augustine's common exposition, namely, that the Lord called the bread his body, because it is the figure and sign of his body, he intends the Church to be understood in some passages, by the words, "THIS is my body;" for, in his Sermon to Children, to be found at the end of Fulgentius's works, he speaks thus: "These things are called Sacraments, because we see one thing in them, and understand another, &c. If, therefore, you wish to know what the body of Christ is, hearken to the Apostle saying, ye are the body and members of Christ." And in the twenty-sixth Treatise on St. John: "By this meat and drink the Lord meant us to understand the community of his body and his members—namely, the holy Church of the predestinated."

Pope Innocent III. holds the same doctrine; for, in the

fourth book of the Mysteries of the Mass, he says, "that Christ has two bodies,—namely, his natural body, which he took of the Virgin, and which was crucified for us; and his mystical body—namely, the Church." Then he adds: "The mystical body is spiritually eaten—that is to say, by faith, under the species of bread."

It is manifest from all that goes before, that he who, in reading the Scriptures, which are themselves clear and certain, takes the Fathers for his guide, entangles himself with extraordinary difficulties, and flings himself into darkness, and into a labyrinth which has no outlet. Extensive reading, conducted with scrutinizing care, is necessary for the attainment of even a moderate knowledge of them. If any read them carefully, and with an unprejudiced mind, though he meet with errors, and little agreement among them, still he will find them as far removed from the doctrine of the Romish Church as heaven is from the earth.

CHAP. XXXI.

That the Roman Church condemning impanation has herself fallen, by Transubstantiation, into an error a thousand times more pernicious; and concerning the worship of the accidents of bread.

We have shewn that many of the Fathers believed in a union of our Lord's divinity with the Eucharistical bread, resembling the personal union of his two natures. Transubstantiation is an imitation, but the very worst, of that doctrine; for, while the Fathers conjoined the divinity of Christ with the substance of bread, the Romish Church

conjoins both natures of Jesus Christ with the accidents of bread in a closer union than that which the Impanators place between his divinity and the Sacramental bread.

For the ancients did not conceive that the bread ought to be worshipped because there was a union of its substance with Jesus Christ. But the Romish Church worships the accidents of bread—that is to say, the roundness, whiteness, taste, and size of the host—on account of their union with the body of Christ, with the same adoration as the body of Jesus Christ. The Council of Trent ordains, Sess. XIII. that the Sacrament be worshipped with sovereign worship, under pain of anathema. Now, by Sacrament the Council meant the body of Christ with the species or accidents. This error we have already exposed.

It is, therefore, highly iniquitous in our adversaries of the Roman Church to condemn those who place a mystical and ineffable union between Christ's divinity and the Sacramental bread, since they themselves put another, a thousand times more absurd and pernicious, between Christ and the accidents of bread. I say more absurd; for the union of two substances is easily conceivable, but to unite one substance with the accidents of another substance, as if one should put the moon under the accidents of a horse, is a thing and conceit that surpasses all the fancies of hypochondriacs, and which could never possess the mind of any one who has not renounced the use of his reason. This doctrine, besides, destroys the nature of the Sacrament, and the humanity of Jesus, as we have proved, and obliges men to worship bread with sovereign worship: things that the ancient Church neither believed nor practised.

It appears that Satan projected this doctrine, and made a trial of it, in the temptation of Christ in the wilderness;—for, in promising him imaginary kingdoms, he proposed ac-

cidents without subjects,—in speaking to him of the change of stones into bread, he spoke of a transubstantiation.

CHAP. XXXII.

That the Sacrifice of the Mass was not instituted by Jesus Christ.—Confession of our adversaries.

The Holy Supper is not called a sacrifice in the holy Scripture. Jesus Christ, when instituting this Sacrament, neither offered nor presented any thing to his Father, but merely said to his disciples, "Take, eat." He made no elevation of the host, and the apostles did not worship the Sacrament. In short, none of the actions were performed necessarily requisite in a sacrifice properly so called. Cardinal Bellarmine freely confesses this, saying: "The oblation which follows consecration, belongs to the integrity of the sacrifice, but not to its essence: this is proved by our Lord's not having made any oblation, nor even his apostles, in the beginning, as we have demonstrated from Gregory."* A most notable confession, by which this Cardinal would persuade us that Christ and his apostles made a sacrifice, without offering any thing—that is to say, he did not offer himself in sacrifice in the Eucharist—but the Roman Church now offers him in sacrifice, contrary to his own example, and that of his apostles.

The Jesuit Salmeron, in the first book of his Commentaries upon Paul's Epistles, tom. xiii. gives an enumeration of unwritten traditions, in which rank he places "the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy,—that is to say, the Papal Monarchy,

* Bellar. lib. i. de Missac, c. 27, Sec. Quinta.

and the worship of images, the Mass, and the mode of sacrificing; and the tradition that Jesus offered a sacrifice in bread and wine."* Mark the reasons why he thinks it was inexpedient that those things should be written or orally taught: "It is stupidity to think that the apostles have written all, or delivered all by tradition:—that would be doing injury to the holy Spirit acting and revealing; and it would be a thing quite at variance with nature, which does not comprehend all things at once."† He assigns particularly why these things ought not to be written,—namely, "that the command of Christ might be kept, Give not that which is holy to dogs."‡ If we were to believe this Doctor, the doctrine of the birth and passion of the Saviour was given to dogs; for it was the will of God that it should be written. By the dogs he means Princes and people.

Cardinal Baronius§ makes the same confession, and frankly acknowledges that the Eucharistical sacrifice is an unwritten tradition, of which, consequently, there is no mention made in the Gospel. The Jesuit Gregory, of Valentia, writes, in the first book of the Mass, chap. iv.: "Although this service or worship (of the Mass) should not have been instituted by God, yet these men should not conclude that it is not lawful, for we have shewn that that (viz. the commandment of God) is not necessarily required to constitute a service good."

All these Doctors speaking thus, tacitly condemn the Council of Trent, which defines and declares, Sess. XXII. chap. i., that by these words, Do this in remembrance of me, the Lord established the Priesthood of the New Tes-

---

* Parte 3, Disp. 8, Sec. Quinto opus, Et. Sec. Postremo. Et. Sec. Porro. —† Sec. Quinto Traditio. —‡ Quinto opus. —§ Baron. Annal. ad annum 53, Sec. 13.

tament. Matthew and Mark would not have omitted these words, if by them the Lord had instituted the New Testament Sacrifice and Priesthood.

CHAP. XXXIII.

That the Sacrifice of the Mass accords neither with Scripture nor with reason.

I. Two thirds of Paul's Epistle to the Hebrews are occupied with the discussion of the sacrifice and priesthood of the Christian church, where nevertheless there is nothing said of the Eucharist, nor of any other sacrifice of redemption, than the death of Jesus Christ.

II. Besides, in various passages, especially towards the end of the ninth chapter, the Apostle says, "as it is appointed for men once to die, so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many." This teaches, that as men die but once, and as their death is not reiterated neither with blood nor without blood, in like manner the sacrifice which Christ offered of himself for our sins is never repeated: and in the tenth chapter it is twice expressly said, that Jesus Christ offered *unicam oblationem—one sacrifice*—and then sat down at the right hand of God.

III. For since the death of Christ is a sufficient price and sacrifice for our redemption, there is no more need of another sacrifice of redemption. If, to apply the sacrifice of Christ to us, it be necessary to sacrifice him again, then, to apply his death to us, it will, for the same reason, be necessary for him to die again. Jesus Christ and his death are applied to us by the breaking of bread, 1 Cor. x. 16; and by baptism, Gal. iii. 27; and by faith, through which

Paul says he dwells in our hearts, Ephes. iii. 17, but not by sacrificing him.

IV. But how can Jesus Christ satisfy in the mass for our sins, since he is no more in a state to satisfy or to suffer for us? but is only in a condition to intercede and supplicate in our behalf, as Bellarmine acknowledges: * "Christ (says he) cannot now merit nor satisfy, but supplicate only; wherefore the proper virtue and efficacy of this sacrifice is to procure by intreaty;" it is not therefore to redeem and to satisfy. But for procuring by intreaty there can be no need to sacrifice Christ any more, the intercession by which he makes requests for us at his Father's right hand being all prevalent. Rom. viii. 33.

V. Moreover, the pastors in the Christian church are never called priests in Scripture to distinguish them from the people. But all the faithful are called priests by Peter, 1 Epist. ii. 9; and by John, Rev. i. 6: "Jesus Christ hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father."

VI. The apostle Paul enumerates, Ephes. iv. 11, the offices which Christ left to his Church at his ascension to heaven. "He gave some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers." He does not speak at all of priests and sacrifices. Neither is the priesthood mentioned in the first Epist. to Timothy, nor in that to Titus, where he describes the duties of ministers, whom he calls bishops and deacons.

VII. It is evident that the sacrificer is more excellent than the thing sacrificed. Thus Aaron was more excellent than the beasts he offered; not only because he was man and had these sacrifices in his power, but also because the lambs and bullocks were figures of Jesus Christ, who, as man,

---

* Bellar. lib. ii. de Missa, cap. i. sec. secundo.

was to die for us: but Aaron represented Jesus Christ as God, offering his body in sacrifice to his Father for our sins. The priests, therefore, in boasting that they sacrifice Jesus Christ, rank themselves above him.

VIII. It is necessary in every sacrifice, that the thing sacrificed and offered to God be destroyed. But Jesus suffers nothing in the mass, and is not destroyed. He is, therefore, not sacrificed in the mass. To say that the sacramental being or substance of Jesus is destroyed in the mass is mere trifling; for Jesus has only one being, namely, his natural being; and this expression, "*sacramental being*," is equivalent to *significative being*, which is a chimera. The chief object they pretend to have in the mass, is to sacrifice Jesus Christ for our redemption. But the sacramental or significative being of the Lord is not the price of our redemption, nor is it sacrificed for us. If the sacrifice is offered when the species of bread and wine are destroyed, then we must say that the sacrifice is performed in the priest's stomach some hours after mass is ended, for a certain time must elapse before the species be destroyed by digestion.

IX. Add that in every sacrifice the thing to be sacrificed must be consecrated, there must then be some consecration in every sacrifice. But in the mass there is nothing consecrated. The bread is not consecrated, for they assert it is no more. The body of Christ is not consecrated, for he cannot be consecrated by men; it is Christ who consecrates us. The accidents of bread are not consecrated, for they are not offered to God in sacrifice, otherwise the mass would be a sacrifice of accidents, of colour, taste, lines, and superficies.

X. Never do our adversaries find themselves more perplexed than when called to point out in the institution of

this Sacrament some action in which the sacrifice consists, by which they pretend that the consecrated host is offered to God as a propitiatory sacrifice. Does this sacrifice consist in the words whereby the priest presents the body of Christ unto God, and beseeches him to accept it as an agreeable offering? But we have seen in the preceding chapter how our adversaries confess that Christ made no oblation, and presented nothing to his Father. Does the sacrifice consist in breaking bread? But that is impossible; for Jesus brake the bread before pronouncing the words which they call the consecration; he therefore did not break a consecrated host. And though the priest lets the consecrated host fall entire and unbroken into the cup, yet, as Ballarmine* acknowledges, the mass is still called a sacrifice. Perhaps they may say the sacrifice consists in the manducation; but that cannot be. For to eat is not to sacrifice;—if eating be sacrificing, every one of the people who eats the host is a priest, and the people's mouths are so many altars. In all the sacrifices under the Mosaic law at which the people did eat of the things sacrificed, the sacred feast took place some hours after the sacrifice was was ended. Nor can the sacrifice consist in the pronunciation of the consecrating words; for by these words, This is my body, the priest offers nothing to God. But every sacrifice is an offering to God. Besides, in every sacrifice, the sacrificer addresses himself to God; but these words are addressed to the bread. Moreover, we have seen our opponents admitting in the confessions recorded above, that Jesus offered nothing to God. There was, therefore, no sacrifice.

XI. It is to be observed, that the order of priesthood

---

* Bellar. lib. i. de Missa. c. 7, Sec. 6.

is a Sacrament in the Church of Rome, the institution of which, it is pretended, is to be found in the institution of the Eucharist, when the Lord said "Do this," as if he had instituted two Sacraments by the same words. They would be guilty of no greater absurdity though they were to pretend finding the institution of Marriage or extreme Unction, in the institution of Baptism. If the words, "Do this in memory of me," are the formulary by which Jesus conferred the order of priesthood, whence is it that bishops, in conferring this order at the four seasons, do not use the same words?

XII. Our adversaries reckon two kinds of sacrifice—the one bloody, the other unbloody—which they call the "Sacrifice of Melchizedek;" affirming it to be far more excellent than the bloody, and will have the mass to be the sacrifice according to the order of Melchizedek. Whence it follows, that the mass is more excellent than the death of Christ, which was a bloody sacrifice. It is, therefore, very amazing that the apostle, when speaking at such length upon the priesthood of Melchizedek, made no mention either of the Mass or the Eucharist.

XIII. But how could Christ, in these words, "Do this in remembrance of me," command men to sacrifice him in the mass, since it is impossible to sacrifice Jesus Christ in remembrance of Jesus Christ? Seeing, also, that immediately after these words Paul adds the explanation of them, saying, "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come." 1 Cor. xi. He teaches us that to "Do this," is to eat bread and drink the cup in remembrance of the Lord's death.

Here, therefore, every man who fears God and loves the Lord Jesus Christ, will consider what a crime it is in mortal and sinful men to take it upon them to sacrifice the

eternal Son of God to his Father; and to be priest, according to the order of Melchizedek, without order and without commission.

CHAPTER XXXIV.

In what sense the holy Supper may be called a sacrifice. Concerning the sacrifice of Melchizedek, and the oblation of which Malachi speaks.

Our alms, prayers, praises, thanksgivings, and in general all worship whatsoever, are called sacrifices in the holy Scripture. The holy Supper is, in this sense, likewise, called a sacrifice. The question, however, between us and our adversaries, is not whether the Eucharist may be called a sacrifice, but whether it can be truly or properly called the sacrifice of our redemption,—and whether the priests, in the Mass, do really and truly sacrifice the body of Jesus Christ for the sins of the dead and the living.

Our adversaries produce no proof, on this point, from the New Testament, where the institution of this sacrifice should be found. They only quote from the Old Testament the example of Melchizedek, who, they say, sacrificed bread and wine. (Gen. xiv. 18.) This is falsely alleged, for the passage says no such thing. Melchizedek presented bread and wine to Abraham, to refresh his troop, but he offered no sacrifice of bread and wine to God. Even the Bible of the Romish Church has *proferens*—not offering. We shall suppose, however, that is quoted fairly. If the Mass, then, be the sacrifice of Melchizedek, it follows that the Mass is a sacrifice of bread and wine, and not of flesh, bones, and blood. It thence also follows, that the Mass is

not a sacrifice of redemption; for bread and wine offered in sacrifice, cannot be the price of our redemption. It would be a very great error to think that Melchizedek sacrificed bread and wine for the redemption of any one. The victim, in the propitiatory sacrifices under the Old Testament, was always put to death, and without the shedding of blood, there was no propitiation, as saith the Apostle, (Heb. ix. 22); in short, it is speaking against common sense thus to argue: "Melchizedek offered bread and wine; therefore the priest sacrifices the body and blood of the Lord."

They object, also, a passage in Malachi, ch. i., wherein God promises, that in every place "incense shall be offered unto his name, and a pure offering," which is a prophecy of the calling of the Gentiles, by which God foretold that an acceptable service should be offered to him among the nations. There is nothing at all said concerning the sacrifice of the Lord's body. All that is new in this service is, that it will be performed by all nations, instead of being rendered by the Jewish people only, as in the time of Malachi.

They assert that the passover of the Old Testament was a sacrifice, and, consequently, that the holy Supper which succeeded it must likewise be a sacrifice. They speak with as much reason as if I should say, because day is clear, the night which succeeds must also be clear,—that age must be robust, because it succeeds robust youth,—that death must be life, because it succeeds life,—and that the New Testament is the Old, because it succeeds the Old. The succession of one thing to another usually brings mighty changes with it. Besides, our adversaries do not allow that the Mass is a sacrifice like that of the passover; for the passover was not sacrificed by priests, nor offered upon the altar of the temple. It was a domestic sacrifice, which private persons offered in their own houses, as appears from the

passover which Christ celebrated with his disciples, at which there was no priest employed. And even although our opponents could have proved, by this example, that the Eucharist is a sacrifice, still it would remain to be proved that the body of Jesus Christ is really sacrificed in it.

CHAPTER XXXV.

In what sense the Fathers called the Eucharist a Sacrifice.

The ancient Fathers, endeavouring to allure the Pagans to the Christian faith, who imagined there could be no religion where there was no sacrifice, and also to conciliate the Jews, whose religion, under the Old Testament, consisted chiefly in sacrifices, called the Holy Supper a sacrifice, the Sacred Table an altar, and those who served at it Levites.

But they shew sufficiently in what sense they call the Holy Supper sacrifice, since they call it *Eucharist*, that is, thanksgiving, and not sacrifice of propitiation. St. Augustine, indeed, calls it, in the Confessions, b. ix. c. 12, "the Sacrifice of our price." But we have produced a multitude of passages from this very Father, in which it is affirmed, that in the Sacrament, the signs usually receive the names of the things signified. That this is what the Fathers meant when they speak thus, is obvious from their likewise calling the Eucharist the death of Christ. Cyprian does so in his sixty-third Epistle: "The Passion of the Lord is the sacrifice which we offer. And Chrysostom, in his twenty-first Homily upon the Acts: "Whilst this death is perfecting, and this fearful sacrifice, and these ineffable

mysteries." And, in like manner, in the Canon Hoc est, second Distinction of the Consecration: "The immolation of Christ's flesh, which is performed by the priest's hands, is called his passion, death, and crucifixion, not according to truth, but by a significant mystery."

Augustine, in his twenty-third Epistle to Boniface: "Was not Christ once sacrificed in himself? and, nevertheless, he is sacrificed to the people in the sacred sign." And in the City of God, b. 10, c. 5: "The visible sacrifice is a Sacrament—that is to say, a sacred sign of an invisible sacrifice." And afterwards: "What men call sacrifice is the *sign* of the true sacrifice." Observe that he says, "what men call sacrifice," admitting that the Holy Scripture does not give it that name. We have then, in these passages, a clear exposition of that one in which he calls the Eucharist "the sacrifice of our purchase."

In the Apostolical Constitutions, b. 6, c. 23: "The Lord, instead of a bloody sacrifice, instituted a reasonable, unbloody, and mystical sacrifice, which is celebrated, in consideration of the Lord's death, by the signs of his body and blood."

In the fifth chap. of the fourth book of Sacraments, attributed to Ambrose, we have the words of the ancient Service: "Grant that this oblation, which is the FIGURE of the Lord's body and blood, may be regarded as ours, reasonable and acceptable." Subsequent ages erased the word FIGURE.

Procopius Gazaeus, on Genesis, ch. 49: "Jesus Christ gave to his disciples the image, or figure and type of his body and blood, accepting no longer the bloody sacrifices of the Law."

Eusebius, in the Evangelical Demonstration, b. 1, c. 10: "The Lord having offered a sacrifice, and an excellent vic-

tim to his Father, for the salvation of us all, ordained us to offer, continually, the *commemoration* instead of the sacrifice." And at the same place: "We have received the *commemoration* of this sacrifice, that we may celebrate it at his table, by the *signs* of his body and blood, according to the institution of the New Testament."

In short, the Fathers are full of such passages as these. Moreover, they do not distinguish, in the Eucharist, between Sacrament and sacrifice: but, properly speaking, there is as much difference between sacrifice and Sacrament as between giving and receiving; for in a sacrifice we offer to God, but in the Sacrament we receive from him.—The Fathers do not make this distinction; but they call the Sacrament a sacrifice, because it is the sign and figure of the sacrifice.

This custom of calling the Holy Supper a sacrifice, owes its origin to the offerings and gifts which the people anciently offered upon the Sacred Table before communion, which gifts were commonly called sacrifices and oblations, and hence the word *oublie*, unconsecrated host. Cyprian, in his Sermon on Alms, reprimands a rich woman who had brought no sacrifice, and yet took her portion of the sacrifice that the poor had brought. And in the twenty-first Dist. Canon Cleros: "The sub-deacons receive the oblations from the faithful in the temple of the Lord, and carry them to the *Levites*, to be placed upon the altars. This manner of speaking continues still in the Mass, in which, before consecration, the priest says, "receive, Lord, this immaculate host," &c., as Bellarmine acknowledges, in c. 27 of the first book on the Mass. And he there proves it by Irenaeus, who says, b. 4, c. 32, that we offer to God a sacrifice of his creatures,—namely, of bread and wine, and that before consecration.

The Fathers have herein said nothing but what is con-

sonant to the faith. The error, however, which arose from it a long time afterwards, is a striking example to us that the safest way is to adhere to the language of the Apostles, and not to depart from the style of the holy Scripture.

CHAPTER XXXVI.

Of the two kinds of manducation of Christ's body,—namely, of the corporal and spiritual, and which is the better.

Metaphors are similies contracted and reduced to a single word. Thus we say feeding for teaching,—flourishing for prosperity,—pride is called a swelling, and truth a light,—and a child's tongue is said to be untied, and his mind to be opened. Such metaphors are useful as well as ornamental: for they present to us an image of the things spoken of, and render them more intelligible by tacit comparison. In particular, it is a very common thing to express the functions and qualities of the soul by terms borrowed from the functions and qualities of the body. Thus we say envy gnaws, love burns, avarice is a thirst of gold, and hope a tickling desire.

The holy Scriptures are full of such modes of speech.—There is nothing more common in them, than to speak of good instructions as meats and drinks; of the graces of God as a water that quenches thirst; and of the desire of these graces as a hungering and a thirsting. Thus the Supreme Wisdom says, Prov. ix.: "Come, eat of my bread, and drink of the cup which I have mingled." David says, Ps. xxxvi: "Thou shalt make them drink of the rivers of

thy pleasures ;" and in Ps. xxxiv. : " O taste and see that the Lord is good." Jeremiah saith, ch. xv. : " Thy words were found, and I did eat them." And, " God himself invites the thirsty to drink of the waters." Isa. lv. And that it might be understood that he speaks of spiritual drink, he adds : " Incline your ear, and your soul shall live."— Agreeably to this mode of speech, Peter, in his first Epistle, ch. ii., recommends us " to desire the sincere milk of the word." And Paul says to the Corinthians, 1 Cor. iii. 2 : " I have fed you with milk, and not with meat." Metaphors taken from bodily meats and drinks, are used by none more frequently than by our blessed Lord. He says, John iv. : " My meat is to do the will of him that sent me." In the same chapter, also, he saith : " Whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst." And, in the seventh chapter : " If any one thirst, let him come to me and drink." And he says, also, in Matth. v. : " Blessed are they who do hunger and thirst after righteousness."

Such figurative modes of speech are interspersed throughout a large portion of John vi., where our Lord, addressing the Capernaites, promises to give them the bread of heaven ; and says, my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. Two reasons induced him to speak in this manner. The one, our Lord being accounted inferior to Moses by the Jews of Capernaum ; and being reproached with impotence, in that Moses had given manna, which they called bread, from heaven, upon this Jesus took occasion to say unto them, that he would give them another bread, come down from heaven, much better than the manna,— namely himself, who came down from heaven to give life and nourishment to their souls. The other reason that moved him to speak in figurative terms was, that he was

addressing rebellious Jews, to whom St. Matthew says—"without a parable spoke he not unto them." Matth. xiii. 34.

Our opponents here acknowledge with us, that there is a mode of eating the body of Christ which is spiritual, and which is performed not by the mouth of the body, but by faith in Christ, by whom we obtain spiritual life and nourishment. The Council of Trent itself teaches, that "some eat this bread only spiritually and by a lively faith." Sess. xiii. c. 8.

But besides this spiritual eating, the Roman Church forges a corporal manducation, by which the faithful receive the body of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist corporally by the mouth, chew it with the teeth, and transmit it to the stomach; and this they call real and true, in opposition to spiritual, of which they often speak with contempt, as of a picture or a thing which exists only in the imagination. This much at least is tacitly held by the Council of Trent, which says, that there are some who eat this bread *only spiritually*, as if that were a small matter in comparison with a really oral manducation. Nevertheless, when we press them, they are constrained to acknowledge that spiritual eating is much the more excellent, and that corporal manducation, which they defend with so much ardour, is of little consequence; for they confess that many are saved without partaking of the Eucharist, but that no one is saved without faith in Jesus Christ;—and they acknowledge also that many eat the sacrament, who, nevertheless, perish eternally; but that whosoever eats the flesh of Christ spiritually, and with a true faith, shall obtain an everlasting salvation, according to our Lord's declaration, "that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have eternal life." John iii. 15.

Further: our adversaries admit, that the eating of the sacrament, without spiritual eating by faith, is not only useless, but is even turned into condemnation; and that it is useful only on account of its being a spiritual eating. But spiritual eating alone, without the corporal manducation, fails not to be profitable, and is always necessary to salvation. The eating the sacrament corporally by the mouth is common to the righteous and the wicked, and hypocrites partake in that way as well as true believers. Our adversaries hold, indeed, that beasts may eat it like other food, and that mice sometimes run away with the body of the Lord; but spiritual manducation is the exclusive privilege of the children of God, and none but true believers can participate therein. Jesus Christ says (Matth. xv.) that that which entereth in at the mouth defileth not the man; whence it follows also that it cannot sanctify him.

The language of St. Augustine is, in this particular, very far removed from that of the Romish Church of our time, which does not allow any other real and true manducation of Christ's body than that which is performed orally and corporally in the Eucharist. For this good Doctor holds, on the contrary, that there is no other real and true manducation of Christ's body than that which is spiritual; and that the corporal and oral is not a true manducation. This is what he maintains in the City of God:* "The Lord shews (says he) that eating the body of Christ consists not merely in the sacrament, but in truth." And again, "They have eaten the body of Christ not merely in the sacrament, but in deed and in truth." Thomas corroborates the opinion of St. Augustine on this point, in the seventh lesson on the sixth chapter of John, where, speaking of the man

* Lib. xxi. c. xxv.

who eats the body of Christ spiritually, he says: " This is he who eats the body of Christ not sacramentally only, but in truth."

CHAPTER XXXVII.

That in the sixth chapter of John, the Lord neither speaks of the Sacrament of the Eucharist, nor of the oral manducation of his flesh.

By corporal manducation, we understand the eating of bread and wine, which Jesus Christ honoured with the title of his body and blood, because they are the sacrament and commemoration of them. But our opponents pretend actually to eat the body of Jesus Christ with the mouth, and to transmit it into the stomach; and to support this very gross and Capernaitical manducation, they allege the sixth chapter, where Jesus says that he is the bread come down from heaven, and promises to give them his flesh to eat.

I. To believe that, we must purposely shut our eyes and contradict the Son of God,—for the whole discourse is addressed to the Jews of Capernaum, to whom he promises to give his flesh to eat. If by these words he promised to give them the Eucharist, he deceived them, for he never administered nor presented to them the Holy Supper.

II. That even appears by the time at which Jesus Christ pronounced this discourse. The Holy Supper was not then instituted, nor till about two years after. How could our Lord's disciples know that he spoke to them of the Eucharist which had yet no existence, and which had never yet been mentioned any where throughout this discourse?

III. Does our Lord make the slightest mention of the table, or of the cup, or of the supper, or of the breaking of bread, or of the distribution of bread among many? In short, there are none of those actions wherein the administration of sacrament consists.

IV. It is to be remarked, that Jesus Christ often speaks in the present tense. He does not say, "I shall be the bread of life,—I shall be the bread come down from heaven;" but "I am the bread come down from heaven,—I am the bread of life; and he who eats my flesh hath eternal life." He was, therefore, the bread of life before the Holy Supper was instituted; and this bread could be eaten, and was the nourishment of the soul, at the time when the Holy Supper was not yet in existence.

V. Now, that by eating and drinking the Lord means believing and confiding in himself, and thereby being made alive and sustained, he himself shews, saying, (verse 35,) "I am the bread of life; he who comes unto me shall never hunger; and whosoever believes in me shall never thirst." Who does not see that in this passage *believe* is put for *drink*, since thirst is quenched by believing; and as by the word *come* he speaks of a spiritual *coming*, so by the word *drink* he means a spiritual mode of *drinking?*

VI. And when the Lord says, (verse 47,) "He that believeth on me hath eternal life,—I am the bread of life," who does not see that this bread is received by believing? For Jesus Christ shews how he is the bread of life, viz. that they who believe on him have eternal life.

VII. Even the words on which our adversaries found the most, are those which are most adverse to them. The Lord says, (verse 53,) "Except ye eat the flesh, and drink the blood of the Son of Man, ye have no life in you."—Here it is evident that he speaks of a manducation neces-

sary to salvation, and without which no one can be saved. He does not, therefore, speak of a corporal and oral manducation of the Sacrament, seeing that without it so many are saved. To say that this manducation is not necessary in the fact, but in wish and desire, is to approach to our belief, and to reduce the necessity to a spiritual manducation. Besides, to say that no one is saved without desiring to partake of the Lord's Supper, is to exclude John the Baptist and the malefactor who was crucified with our Lord, from salvation, neither of whom partook of it either by act or wish. And we might bring the example of many Pagans and idolators who, by hearing the words of martyrs, were suddenly converted, and were executed the same hour, without ever having heard of this Sacrament, and consequently without having formed any wish to partake of it. Many suffered martyrdom without even being baptised, and therefore were far from being prepared to partake of the Eucharist.

VIII. The same thing likewise appears by what Jesus Christ adds in verse 54: "Whoso eateth my flesh hath eternal life." He does not speak of the manducation of the Sacrament, for many who eat of it have not eternal life. The usual evasion is, that Jesus Christ speaks of such as eat of this flesh *worthily;* from which it appears how clearly the truth is on our side. For, according to our belief, the words of the Lord are true without any addition. —But our opponents, to extricate themselves, add their glosses, which proceed from their own invention, and not from the word of God. We may indeed eat of the bread unworthily, as Paul says, (1 Cor. xi.) "whosoever shall eat this bread unworthily." But it is impossible to eat of the flesh of the Lord unworthily, since, as we have shewn, to *eat* is to *believe*.

We can no more believe in Jesus Christ unworthily than than we can love God unworthily, seeing that our worthiness consists in believing in Jesus Christ, and in loving God. This is what Cardinal Cajetan remarks on John vi. saying, "Jesus Christ does not say, whoso eats my flesh and drinks my blood worthily, but whoso eats and drinks; that we might know that he speaks of an eating and a drinking that has no need of modification," &c. It, therefore, clearly appears, that this discourse ought not to be understood literally; and that the Lord does not speak of eating and drinking the Sacrament, but of believing, and of being spiritually nourished by faith in his death.

IX. The Lord adds, in v. 56: "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him." These words are decisive of the controversy. For they would be false if they were understood of the manducation of the Sacrament, it being a thing certain that hypocrites and the profane, who participate in the Sacrament, do not dwell in Christ, nor Christ in them. They receive the Sacrament into their stomach, and there it is soon destroyed by digestion. But to dwell in Christ is to be united to him by the constant, lasting, and reciprocal union, between him and believers.—For Cornelius Jansenius very justly remarks, that "he who eats my flesh, and drinks my blood, dwells in me, and I in him; that is to say, he is intimately united to me, and I to him." And then he proves it by other passages: "He that dwelleth in love, dwelleth in God, and God in him." 1 John iv. 16. And again: "He that keepeth his commandments, dwelleth in him, and he in him; and hereby we know that he abideth in us, by the Spirit he hath given us." Chap. iii. 24. Thence he infers that the Lord speaks in John vi. concerning a manner of eating peculiar

to those who have faith working by love, and not of a corporal manducation, in which the wicked are partakers.

X. If, to have Christ dwelling in us, it be necessary to eat him with our mouths; for the same reason, it will be necessary that he should eat us, that we may dwell in him.

XI. To direct our minds from carnal thoughts, Jesus adds, v. 63; "It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing." Since by Spirit he means his Spirit, by which we are regenerated, so also by flesh he means his human body. But it, he assures us, profits nothing—viz. by being taken in the way in which the Capernaites imagined. What would it profit a man to have Christ's head and feet in his stomach: or whether he swallowed it entire or by morsels? The absurdity is in each way equally great.

XII. Jesus adds: "The words that I speak unto you are spirit and are life;" that is to say, life-giving and spiritual. They are quickening only to those who understand them spiritually, and who fancy no corporal or carnal manducation. This doctrine was maintained by Augustine, in his twenty-seventh Treatise upon John. He asks: "What are we to understand by these words, they are spirit and life?" He replies: "It is necessary to understand them spiritually. Hast thou understood them spiritually? They are spirit and life to thee. Hast thou understood them carnally? In this manner, also, they are spirit and life, but not unto thee."

XIII. At this the Capernaites and some of his disciples were offended, and said, It is a hard saying. Then he answered, "What if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where he was before?" Augustine favours us with an explanation of these words, also, in the Treatise just quoted: "What does he mean in these words? He there solves the question that perplexed them. They thought he would

give them his body; but he said unto them he would certainly ascend entire into heaven. When ye see the Son of Man ascending into heaven, where he was before, then, at least, you will surely see that he does not give you his body as ye thought,—then, at least, ye will understand that his grace is not consumed by morsels."

CHAPTER XXXVIII.

That the Church of Rome deprives the people of salvation by this doctrine.

That which, in the whole of this discourse of our Lord, most embarrasses our opponents, is a clause in the fifty-third verse: "Verily, I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, you have no life in you." For if, in these words, Christ spoke of receiving the Sacrament, then it follows that the members of the Roman Church, who are deprived of the cup, have no life, and are eternally lost, for they do not drink the blood of Jesus Christ. To say, as Bellarmine does, that the people receive blood in the host, is nothing to the purpose; for Christ not only commanded them to take his blood, but likewise to drink it. If he speaks of the Sacrament, then he not only commands them to partake of his blood, but likewise declares the way and manner in which he designs they should partake—namely, *to drink*—which is the prescribed mode of participation. In short, he commands them to *drink*. But to eat a dry host is not to drink. If eating means drinking, then the priest drinks twice in the mass—once in taking the host, and again in taking the cup. This is contrary to common sense; and, moreover, Pope

Innocent III. says: "*Neither is the blood drunk under the species of bread, nor is the body eaten under the species of wine.*"* Here, then, our adversaries invent an absurd figure, by which *eating* signifies *drinking*.

They distinguish eating from drinking every where else, but here they confound them as if they meant the same thing. To eat and drink, when taken in a spiritual sense, indeed, signify the same thing. But when they refer to the Sacrament of the Eucharist, to the eating of the bread and drinking of the cup, then eating and drinking are very different things. If eating of the host imply drinking of the cup, then drinking of the cup must also imply eating of the host. And if *drinking* may be taken figuratively, why may not *eating* be taken in the same manner?

The truth is so potent here, that the Jesuit Vasquez does not hesitate to contend firmly and vigorously against Bellarmine, who says that the Lord commands only the perception of his blood, but not the manner of partaking of it. "I do not approve of this answer, (says Vasquez,) because our Lord's words do not refer merely to the thing which is taken, but also the manner of receiving it. For to eat and to drink, if the words be understood in their proper signification, are not applicable to every kind of species; for the blood is not drunk under the species of bread, neither is the body eaten under the species of wine, as Pope Innocent III. has very justly remarked, in the twenty-first chapter of his fourth book."† To this he subjoins the important observation, that, from Bellarmine's answer, maintaining that the expression *to drink* is not to be taken literally, it will

---

* De Myst. Miss. lib. iv. c. 21.—† Vasquez in 3 partem Thomae, tom. iii. Disp. 206, num. 50.

follow that the cup is not once mentioned in the whole chapter.

But these Jesuits who thus contend against their companions, do not introduce any thing better. They affirm that, when Jesus said, "Except ye drink my blood, ye have no life in you," he obliged the people to drink of the cup, and that he drank of it himself, because the priest drinks for the people, and in so doing he represents the whole church. May not the people, for the same reason, refrain from eating the bread, and be satisfied that the priest eats for them? For the command to eat, in this passage, is not more explicit than the command to drink. When Jesus commands the people to believe in him, they might rid themselves from the obligation to believe in Christ by saying, in the same way, that it is sufficient that the priest believes in Christ for them, because he represents the whole church. In short, there is an impious temerity in adding, by one's own authority, whole clauses to the word of the Lord,—clauses as absurd, indeed, as if Jesus had said, Except ye drink my blood yourselves, or, by another, ye shall have no life in you. They affirm, with similar licence, that when Jesus said, Except ye eat my flesh *and* drink my blood, it is necessary to change *and* into *or*, because Christ intended to say, Except ye eat my flesh *or* drink my blood. If it be allowed thus to change the words of the Lord, there is not a law in Scripture from which we may not exempt ourselves. Though the law of God commands us to love God *and* our neighbour, we might, in the same way, say that the law means that we must love God *or* our neighbour: and, that though the law says, Honour thy father and thy mother, it means that we must honour our father *or* mother, and that it is sufficient to honour one of the two.—Besides, from this perversion of our Lord's words, it fol-

lows that the people may drink of the cup without eating the host, because it is sufficient to do one of the two.

CHAPTER XXXIX.

That the principal Doctors of the Roman Church, and even the Popes, agree with us on this point, and hold that the Discourse in John, chap. vi. relates to spiritual manducation, and that those who contradict them speak with uncertainty.

In this controversy, we have the Popes, and also a great multitude of Doctors of the Romish Church, who hold, as we do, that there is not a word in the sixth chapter of John concerning the Eucharist, nor the corporal manducation of Christ's body, but that Jesus speaks there of spiritual manducation, by faith in his own death. Such is the opinion of Pope Innocent III., and Pope Pius II., called Æneas Sylvius, before his elevation to the Popedom; likewise, of Cardinals Bonaventura, Cajetan, Cusanus, De Alliaco; also, of Durand, bishop of Mende, Gabriel Biel, Hesselius, one of the Doctors of the Council of Trent, Lindanus, bishop of Ruremond, Ruard Tapper, Jansenius, bishop of Ghent, Ferus, a divine of Mentz, Valdensis, and many more.* Amongst others, Gabriel Biel, in the thirty-sixth Lesson on the Canon of the Mass, says, that the Doctors,

* Bonaventura in 4 Dist. art. 1, quest. 2; Cajetanus in 6 Johannis; Cusanus epist. 7, ad Bohemos; Petrus de Alliaco in 4 sent. q. 2, art. 3; Durant Rationali Div. Off. l. 4, c. 41, n. 40; Lindanus Panopliac, l. 4, c. 58; Tapper in explic. articulorum 15; Lovanensium. Jansen. Concord. c. 59; Ferus in 26 Mathaei et 6 Johannis; Valdensis, tom. 2 de Sacr. c. 91; Hessel. de communione sub utraque specie.

with one common consent, hold " that the sixth chapter of John relates to spiritual manducation only." But, for brevity's sake, let it suffice to cite the two forenamed Popes.

Pope Innocent III. expresses himself in these words: " The Lord speaks of spiritual manducation, saying, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. In this way the righteous alone eat of the body of Christ." *

A learned Pope is a very rare personage; nevertheless, it may be said of Pope Pius II. that he was one of the most learned men of his age. Arguing against the Bohemians, in his 130th epistle to Cardinal de Carvial, he writes thus: " That is not the sense of the Gospel of John which you ascribe to it; for there is no injunction given there to drink of the Sacrament; but a spiritual manner of drinking is there taught." And shortly after: " the Lord there makes known, by these words, the secret mysteries of spiritual drinking, and not of carnal, when he says, It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing. And again, The words that I speak unto you are spirit and life. Do you wish to know certainly whether the Evangelist speaks of the spiritual manducation, which is performed by faith? Consider what the Lord says in these words, *He that eats and drinks;* these words are of the present and not of the future tense. Therefore, ever since the Lord spake them, there have been persons who have eaten and drunk; and, nevertheless, the Lord had not yet suffered, nor was the Sacrament yet instituted."

On these words, " Except ye eat my flesh, ye have no life in you," Thomas Aquinas says, " If this refers to spiritual manducation, the sentence is free from all ambiguity.

---

* De Myst. Miss. lib. iv. c. xiv.

For he who is a partaker in the unity of the Church, as it is affected by charity, &c., does spiritually eat the flesh of Christ, and drink his blood. But if it relates to sacramental manducation, there is ambiguity in this saying, Except ye eat my flesh, ye have no life in you." But the modern Doctors and Jesuits have renounced this opinion, contemn the authority of the Popes now cited, and teach, that Jesus begins, John vi. 51, to speak of sacramental manducation, but that all before that relates to spiritual manducation. For example, when Jesus Christ says, (verses 33, 35, and 50,) that "he is the bread come down from heaven; that he is the bread of life; that whosoever believeth in him shall never thirst; and that he is the bread come down from heaven, of which whoso eateth shall never die,—they admit that, in all these passages, he speaks of a spiritual manner of eating and drinking, and deny that he speaks of the Eucharistic bread; and therefore they understand these expressions figuratively. This doctrine is full of absurdity, and destroys itself. How audacious to teach two kinds of manducation in the sequel of the same discourse, and to pronounce, with magisterial authority, that one part of the chapter is to be taken figuratively and the other literally, seeing that the same mode of speech is used in both, and the same exposition is equally applicable to both?

The Council of Trent was very much embarrassed with this matter, it being long agitated and controverted in that Assembly. The Prelates seeing the new Doctors opposed to the old, and even to the Popes, and likewise discording among themselves, would determine nothing upon the subject, but left it undecided, as the Jesuit Salmeron, who was present at the Council, assures us: "The Synod (says he) would not expressly determine at that time what was the

most proper and natural sense of the words of Christ in John vi. on account of the various interpretations of the holy Fathers, and of the Doctors, which were brought forward on each side. However it was there especially that that attribute of perfection—the infallibility of the Pope and of the Council—ought to have displayed itself, it being a question of very great importance. The Popes have not determined any thing on the subject even yet, nor have they condemned those who hold an opinion opposite to that of the Jesuits.*

CHAPTER XL.

Reasons by which our adversaries attempt to prove that the discourse in John vi. relates to oral manducation.

But let us see how the Doctors of this age contend against their Popes, Cardinals, and Prelates; and attempt to prove that the sixth chapter of John refers to oral manducation in the Eucharist.

I. They affirm that Jesus Christ speaks in the future tense, saying, "The bread which I shall give," refers to

* It was urged in the Council of Trent, that the sixth chapter of John should be declared to refer to Sacramental eating; but this proposal gave much offence, because it tended to establish the necessity of the communion of the cup, which had already been taken away. Besides, if it were determined that John vi. referred to Sacramental eating, it was apprehended that the Council might be reproached with depriving the people of salvation, by having deprived them of the cup. If the haughty and arrogant Council of Trent would not venture to determine whether John vi. referred to Sacramental and oral, or to spiritual manducation being meant, how presumptuous and unwarrantable is it in individual Romanists,—as Bossuet, Hay, Milner, &c.—to assume that that chapter relates to the Eucharist, and then to adduce it in favour of Transubstantiation.

a manducation yet to come. I answer that he spoke likewise in the present, saying, " I am the living bread, which came down from heaven; if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever." They themselves would ridicule me if, from the Lord saying in the future, " Whosoever shall believe, and shall be baptized, shall be saved," I should infer, that at the time Christ uttered these words, none had believed,—none had been baptized,—none had been saved. In fine, when Jesus spoke in the future, saying, " The bread that I shall give," he was looking forward to his future death, which is the true food of our souls.

II. They say, that if the sixth chapter of John be not understood of oral manducation, it would follow that this disciple hath nowhere spoken of the Eucharist. We shall allow Stapleton, a most furious adversary, to answer for us. " St. John (says he) wrote nothing about the Eucharist, because the other three Evangelists had written fully upon it before him." John wrote much later than the others, and fastened his attention chiefly upon such things as they had omitted. He hath not mentioned in his Gospel either the history of the conception or birth of the Lord, nor yet his temptation in the wilderness, nor his baptism, nor his transfiguration on the Mount.

III. They add, that Jesus Christ made a distinction between eating and drinking, for the purpose of distinguishing the two kinds in the Eucharist. To that I reply, that Jesus speaks of eating and drinking, that we might know that we have in him, and in his death, full and entire spiritual nourishment. God invites the hungry and thirsty to eat and drink. Isaiah lv. 1. Christ says, " I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me, that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom." Luke xxii. Our adversaries admit, that to eat and drink, in these pas-

sages, mean the same thing, and are used in a spiritual sense.

IV. But, say they, it is not fit that Jesus should have used so many figures, and have spoken in terms so obscure, since he could have spoken clearly. We have already shewn that Christ's ordinary manner of speaking to the Jews, was by figures and parables; and that the objection of Moses, having given bread from heaven, made to him by the Capernaites, afforded occasion for the mode of speech used in the discourse, recorded in John, chapter vi. If our adversaries are so much offended with figures, wherefore do they maintain that our Lord speaks of spiritual manducation, and employs figurative language from the 27 down to the 51 verse of this chapter? Why are they desirous of making it appear that, when Christ said, "If ye drink not my blood," he meant *eating* by *drinking?* If the question be about the difficulty, then, what is there in the world more difficult to be understood or believed than this doctrine, which teaches, that Christ ate himself,—that there is an entire human body in each crumb of host,—that the Lord's body is far from itself, and is separated from itself, —that the priest makes a God with words, and that this God is subject to be eaten by rats, and to be carried away with the wind?

V. Still they tell us Christ said, My flesh is meat indeed. Now this word, *indeed*, excludes figure altogether; for they imagine that figurative expressions are not true. If that be so, why do they themselves introduce so many figures? Why are they so anxious that this word *bread* should be taken figuratively, and that *drinking* should signify *eating?* It must, therefore, be affirmed, that Christ spoke falsely when he declared, I am the true vine, (John xv. 1,) or it must be granted that figure is not exclud-

ed by the word *true*. In the same manner the apostle calls paradise *the true tabernacle*. Heb. viii. 2. It is also a common thing to say, that God is the true sun of the soul, and that bad examples are truly the plague and contamination of the mind. These sayings are all figurative, nevertheless they are all true; and, therefore, *true* does not exclude *figure*.

VI. They add another remark not a whit more to the purpose. Christ, say they, used an oath, saying, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you."—Now, say they, it is improper to use figurative language in an oath. But what will they say, then, to such passages as these?—"Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that entereth not in by the door into the sheepfold, but climbeth up some other way, the same is a thief and a robber." John x. 1. And a little after, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, I am the door of the sheep. Verily, I say unto you, Whatsoever ye bind on earth shall be bound in heaven." Matth. xviii. 18. "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except a man be born of water, and of the Spirit," &c. John iii. 5. In these places we have the same oath joined with figurative expressions. What is more, this very verse which they quote, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat my flesh, and drink my blood, you have no life in you,"—is the one in which they wish to make *drinking* signify *eating*. In verse 32 also of this chapter, Jesus Christ calls himself the "*true* bread," in which words our opponents admit that there is a figure. It scarcely requires to be remarked, that Amen, or Verily, is not an oath, but a simple though strong affirmation.

CHAPTER XLI.

Testimony of the Fathers.

It will be useful to hear the Fathers upon this point.—Augustine shall march foremost. In the third book of the Christian Doctrine, c. xvi., "when the Lord says, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you, he seems to command a revolting action, and an atrocious crime. It is, therefore, a figure, in which we are enjoined to communicate in the Lord's passion, and are pleasingly and profitably put in remembrance that the flesh of Christ was wounded and crucified for us." Our opponents make long discourses to rid themselves of this passage, and find out figures in these words, Except ye eat, &c.; namely, that the body of Christ is not eaten in the Eucharist, by morsels, like butcher's meat. But this is evading the point; for Augustine not only says that it is a figure, but declares also how it is to be explained, namely, that to eat Christ's flesh is to recal him to our remembrance and to meditate with pleasure on his dying for us.—This is an exposition that our opponents do not receive.—The same Father, on the ninety-eighth Psalm: "Understand spiritually what I have said unto you, you do not eat that body which you see, nor drink that blood which shall be shed at my crucifixion; I have commended to you a sacred sign, which giveth life when spiritually understood.

This Father hath also given us a long exposition of the sixth chapter of John, in the twenty-fifth, twenty-sixth, and twenty-seventh Treatises upon his Gospel. In the twenty-fifth Treatise he says, "This (namely, to believe,) is to eat the meat that never perisheth. Why dost thou prepare thy teeth and thy stomach? Believe, and thou hast eaten."—In twenty-sixth Treatise: "To believe in him is to eat the

living bread. Whoever believes in him eats him, and is fed invisibly, because he is regenerated invisibly." In the same place also: "By this meat and drink, Christ would have us to understand the society of his body and members, which is the Church of the predestinated." So far was this Father from believing that Christ was orally eaten, that he regards this meat to signify the Church; wherefore he also adds: "This meat, which renders those immortal and incorruptible who partake of it, is the communion of saints, in which there is peace and perfect unity." Further: "To dwell in Christ, and to have him dwelling in us, is, therefore, what is meant by eating this meat, and drinking this drink. And, moreover, whoever does not dwell in Christ, nor has Christ dwelling in him, without doubt does not spiritually eat his flesh nor drink his blood, although he carnally and visibly bruise with the teeth the sacred sign of Christ's body and blood." In short, there is not, in the whole of this good Doctor's three long Treatises, containing the exposition of John vi., a single word concerning the oral manducation of the Lord's body crucified for us. Cardinal Perron is so displeased at this, that he speaks contemptuously of these three Treatises, saying that they are popular sermons, delivered before a mixed auditory, to which he was not disposed to announce openly the belief of the Church.

On these words, The flesh profiteth nothing, Tertullian remarks that, "The sense must be addressed according to the subject spoken of. Because they regarded his words hard and intolerable, as if he had resolved to give them his very flesh to eat, that he might determine the condition of salvation to be spiritual, he premised, it is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing—namely, for the giving of life." Again: "The word was made flesh; consequently, to obtain life, it must be desired and devoured by

the ear, meditated over by the understanding, and digested by faith." Clemens Alexandrinus writes: "He said, eat my flesh, drink my blood, setting forth, by an allegory, the evidence of faith, and the drink of the promise." Origen: "Know that these things written in the divine books are figures, you must understand them not as carnal but as spiritual: for, if ye receive them as carnal, they will harm instead of nourishing you. For there is in the Gospels a letter, which kills him who does not discern the things that are spoken spiritually; for, when it is said, Except ye eat my flesh and drink my blood, you understand it according to the letter, this letter doth kill." The Fathers sometimes, indeed, by way of accommodation, apply John vi. to the Eucharist, because sacramental eating is profitable to spiritual manducation, and because they are analogical.—But we have proved at great length from their works, that by eating Christ's body in the Eucharist, they did not mean that body which was crucified, but call the bread Christ's body, because of its mystical union with his body, and also because the signs take the names of the things signified. These remarks are corroborated by the following remarkable passage in the 130th Epistle of Pope Pius II.: "You need not wonder that some Doctors, speaking of sacramental communion, and persuading the people to it, should employ the words of St. John; for it does not thence follow, that it is the true and proper sense of the passage, but because of a certain resemblance and consonant reason, this meaning is rather drawn than followed. Doctors speaking in the oratorical style, are allowed sometimes to use figures and translations, so that often when speaking of the *sign* they pass to the *thing signified*."

COLVILLE, PRINTER.

DATE DUE

JAN 0 7 2004

MAY 0 3 2009

MAR - 1

GAYLORD #3523PI Printed in USA

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 01030 7397